MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

SUSTAINABILITY AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA, JR., CALEPA BUILDING

1001 I STREET

2ND FLOOR

SIERRA HEARING ROOM

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2007

10:06 A.M.

KATHRYN S. KENYON, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 13061

ii

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- Mr. Gary Petersen, Chairperson
- Ms. Margo Reid Brown
- Mr. Wesley Chesbro

STAFF

- Mr. Mark Leary, Executive Director
- Ms. Julie Nauman, Chief Deputy Director
- Mr. Elliot Block, Chief Counsel
- Ms. Marie Carter, Staff Counsel
- Ms. Deborah Balluch, Executive Assistant
- Ms. Nancy Carr
- Ms. Bonnie Cornwall, Supervisor, Grants & Certification Section $\ensuremath{\mathsf{I}}$
- Mr. Mitch Delmage, Manager, Tire Management Branch
- Ms. Linda Dickinson
- Mr. Nate Gauff
- Mr. Spencer Fine
- Mr. Jim Lee, Deputy Director
- Ms. Piper Miguelgorry
- Mr. Tom Rudy
- Mr. John Smith, Deputy Director
- Ms. Donna Stokes

iii

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

 $\operatorname{Mr.}$ Kevin Taylor, Supervisor, Organics & Resource Efficiency Branch

Ms. Lorraine Van Kekerix, Acting Deputy Director

Mr. Govindan Viswanathan

ALSO PRESENT

Mr. John Cupps, San Luis Obispo Integrated Waste Management Authority

Mr. Evan Edgar, CRRC

Mr. Chuck Flacks, Social & Behavioral Research Institute, California State University, San Marcos

Mr. Terry Leveille, TL & Associates

Ms. Stacy Rianda, Big Fresno Fair

Mr. Stan Warshaw, Desert Solutions, Inc.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

iv

INDEX	PAGE
Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum	1
Public Comment	
A. Deputy Directors' Reports	2
B. Consideration Of The Scope of Work for the 2007/2008 Statewide Waste Characterization Study (Integrated Waste Management Account, FY 2006/07) (February Board Item 19) Motion Vote	5
	36 36
C. Consideration Of The Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program Application for Desert Solutions, Inc. (Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Subaccount FY 2006/07) (February Board Item 20) Motion Vote	44
	54 54
D. Consideration Of the 2006 Waste Reduction Awards Program (WRAP) Winners and WRAP of the Year (WOTY) Winners February Board Item 21) Motion Vote	57
	63 63
E. Consideration Of the Scoring Criteria and Evaluation Process for the Household Hazardous Waste Grant Program (16th Cycle)(Integrated Waste Management Account, FY 2007/08) (February Board Item 22)	89
Motion Vote	103 103
F. Consideration Of Grant Awards for the Targeted Rubberized Asphalt Concrete Incentive Grant Program (Tire Recycling Management Fund, FY 2006/07) (February Board Item 23)	104
Motion Vote	106 106

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

v

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
G. Consideration of Scope of Work and Contractor for the State Agency Partnership to Support the Use of Tire-Derived Products Contract (Tire Recycling Management Fund, FY 2006/07) (February Board Item 24)	107
Motion	122
Vote	122
H. Presentation of the Results of the Oil Reduction Study (February Board Item 25)	65
I. PULLED Oral Presentation on Marin County's Pilot Project Market Assessment Action Plan (MAAP) Team Findings (This item will be heard at the February 13, 2007, Board Meeting, Item 26)	
Adjournment	123
Reporter's Certificate	124

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good morning, and welcome 3 to the California Integrated Waste Management Board's 4 Sustainability and Market Development Committee meeting. 5 As a courtesy, would you please turn your cell phones or 6 put them on silent mode for the meeting today. 7 To begin, I would like to welcome two new members to our committee -- Board Chair Margo Reid Brown, and my 8 friend, Senator Wesley Chesbro. And also, we have one of 9 our other members here, Jeff Danzinger. Welcome. 10 11 And Deb, could you call the roll please? EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Brown? 12 13 MEMBER BROWN: Here. 14 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Chesbro? 15 MEMBER CHESBRO: Here. EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen? 16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Here. 17 Are all the members of the committee up to date on 18 19 ex partes? MEMBER BROWN: I'm up to date, Mr. Chair. 20 21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I am too. 22 Speaker request slips are at the back of the room. 23 Please fill one out and give them over to Deb, please. 24 Is there anyone who wishes to address the 25 Committee on a item that's not on the agenda today?

2 1 Okay.

- 2 Once announcement before we take up today's
- 3 agenda. Item I, the presentation on the Marin County
- 4 Pilot Project has been pulled from the Committee's agenda.
- 5 This item will be heard before the full Board at our next
- 6 meeting.
- 7 Good morning, Lorraine. Are you ready?
- 8 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: I'm ready.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Lorraine, you are
- 10 up.
- 11 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: My name is
- 12 Lorraine Van Kekerix. I'm the acting deputy director for
- 13 the Diversion, Planning, and Local Assistance Division.
- I have a very brief deputy director report for
- 15 you. First of all, we'd just like to remind all of the
- 16 jurisdictions that are listening in that on January 19th,
- 17 they were sent a letter to announce that the Electronic
- 18 Annual Report is due by March 15th of 2007. All of the
- 19 2005 diversion rate calculation factors and the online
- 20 calculator itself are now available.
- 21 Therefore, all jurisdictions, whether or not they
- 22 use the adjustment method to calculate their diversion
- 23 rate, must now complete and file their 2005 Electronic
- 24 Annual Report by the March 15th deadline.
- 25 And we also have a reminder for state agencies.

- 1 State agencies do not use adjustment factors when
- 2 measuring their diversion rates, and so their rates are
- 3 not in arrears the way that local governments are. And
- 4 state agencies are required to submit their annual reports
- 5 for 2006 by April 1st of 2007.
- 6 And my final item is a joint item for a number of
- 7 the divisions, simply to remind the Board that the World
- 8 Ag Expo is taking place February 13th through 15th in
- 9 Tulare, California. The Office of Public Affairs and
- 10 Corky Mau and their RMDZ program have coordinated Board
- 11 booths and staffing the booths to promote specific Board
- 12 resources and programs that the agricultural community
- 13 will be interested in.
- 14 The international agricultural trade show provides
- 15 an opportunity for those in the agricultural community to
- 16 learn about emerging technologies that may impact our
- 17 operations and exchange information with each other.
- 18 Board staff from a variety of programs around the
- 19 Board will be reaching out to a variety of attendees --
- 20 local jurisdiction representatives, the business
- 21 community, the general public, and the agricultural
- 22 community -- to educate them about available Board
- 23 resources such as collection and reprocessing of
- 24 agricultural film plastic, farm and ranch cleanup grants,
- 25 RMDZ loans for qualified agricultural businesses, and

- 1 findings from composting projects that could help farmers
- 2 operate a more sustainable business.
- 3 And since agricultural is the largest industry
- 4 that we have, this is a very important outreach. And
- 5 we're very pleased to be able to present such a wide
- 6 variety of Board programs at the fair.
- 7 And that ends my deputy director report.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Lorraine, this fair is
- 9 international; right?
- 10 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: That's
- 11 correct.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: And there's over a million
- 13 people go to this thing?
- 14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: It's huge.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's huge. And do we have
- 16 our large venue recycling? Is that all set up? Are they
- 17 doing that?
- 18 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: I don't know
- 19 that they have -- they have asked for assistance on the
- 20 large venue recycling for that.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Do we know if they are
- 22 doing that?
- 23 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: We can check.
- 24 I don't know what they are doing in terms of that.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Because that's a

- 1 big thing. Isn't the Edison Research Center across the
- 2 street from that, where they do all the stuff on
- 3 sustainability and their design work and energy
- 4 conservation?
- 5 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Yes, I
- 6 believe that the Edison Institute is across the street.
- 7 When I have driven past, I have seen the institute.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, Lorraine.
- 9 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: We will check
- 10 for you and get back to you on whether they are doing
- 11 venues and recycling program.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. So I guess we are
- on to Item B, Board Item 19?
- 14 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: That's
- 15 correct.
- 16 Consideration of Scope of Work for the 2007/2008
- 17 Statewide Waste Characterization Study, Integrated Waste
- 18 Management Account, Fiscal Year 2006/7. And Nancy Carr
- 19 will be giving the presentation.
- 20 MS. CARR: Good morning, Chair Petersen and Board
- 21 Members. For your consideration today is the Scope of
- 22 work for the 2007/2008 Statewide Waste Characterization
- 23 Study.
- 24 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
- 25 presented as follows.)

6

MS. CARR: First, just a little bit of background 1 2 on waste characterization studies in general. They are 3 simply studies that collect data on what is in the waste 4 stream, the types and the amounts of materials like food, 5 glass, metal, paper, etcetera. We need to know what is in 6 the waste stream and where it comes from, to better manage 7 these materials to their highest and best use. 8 The Board recognized the importance of waste characterization data in its 2001 strategic plan, which 9 calls for a statewide study to be done every four years. 10 11 --000--12 MS. CARR: The last comprehensive statewide study 13 was done in 2003. And I'm going to show you three slides 14 showing example data that are from the 2003 study. The first slide shows how much of the waste that 15 is disposed comes from each major sector of the waste 16 stream. Almost half comes from the commercial sector; 17 about 30 percent from residential sources; and about 18 19 20 percent from self-haulers. --000--20 21 MS. CARR: The second slide shows the composition 22 of the state's overall disposed waste stream from 2003. As 23 you can see, paper, organics, and construction and 24 demolition materials make up the biggest pieces of the 25 pie. And we have data and pie charts like this for each of

- 1 the three sectors from the 2003 study. So we have this
- 2 same data for the residential sector, the commercial
- 3 sector, and the self-haul sector, each individually.
- --000--
- 5 MS. CARR: When we look closely at individual
- 6 material times rather than broad categories, we can
- 7 identify the top ten material types disposed.
- 8 As you can see, food is number one at about
- 9 15 percent of the overall disposed materials. And that
- 10 contributes to the overall organics category that we saw
- in the last slide. So that's why that piece of pie is so
- 12 big.
- 13 Lumber and cardboard are at numbers two and three.
- 14 And they are commonly recovered materials that still show
- 15 up prominently in the disposed waste stream. And these
- 16 two materials contribute to the other large pieces of the
- 17 pie, the C&D materials and paper.
- 18 So that's some of the type of data we can get from
- 19 waste characterization studies.
- --000--
- 21 MS. CARR: New, a little bit of the history of the
- 22 studies the Board has done.
- Our first statewide study was done in 1999. And
- 24 we categorized waste from the three main sectors, but we
- 25 really focused on getting detailed data for the commercial

- 1 sector, so we could update our waste characterization
- 2 database, which is online.
- 3 Our second study was done in 2003. And we didn't
- 4 have as large of a budget for that study. So it's more of
- 5 general update of the waste disposed by the three sectors,
- 6 but we didn't get the detailed information for the
- 7 commercial sector that we got in 1999.
- 8 Funding for the third study was approved before we
- 9 had even finished the second study. And it didn't make
- 10 sense to just repeat that general study right away, and we
- 11 had a larger budget for the third study. So we determined
- 12 four target areas for special study. And these were
- 13 selected industry groups or business groups, like we did
- in 1999, but we didn't do the whole -- I'm sorry -- thank
- 15 you. We didn't --
- 16 --000--
- 17 MS. CARR: -- do the whole spectrum of businesses.
- 18 We just picked some targeted -- 14 targeted groups.
- 19 We also looked at C&D waste as an individual
- 20 entity. We looked at residuals from MRFs for the first
- 21 time, and we also looked at commercial self-haul and drop
- 22 box loads in detail.
- 23 And we presented the results of those studies to
- 24 the Board last June.
- 25 --000--

- 1 MS. CARR: So now we have an opportunity to do
- 2 another statewide study. So I would like to describe what
- 3 we propose to do. This next study would be another
- 4 comprehensive statewide study that would follow the method
- 5 used in 2003, so the data would be directly comparable to
- 6 that study.
- 7 The basic method would be to collect samples of
- 8 waste from trucks delivering to disposal facilities and
- 9 sort and weigh all the materials in each sample. Data
- 10 would be collected on each of the three main sectors, as
- 11 we did before, and would be analyzed to determine the
- 12 amount coming from each sector and the composition of the
- 13 waste from each sector. And again, all the data would be
- 14 combined to provide an overall statewide composition of
- 15 the waste disposed in California.
- 16 --000--
- 17 MS. CARR: Well, since I'm a numbers kind of
- 18 person, I thought I would give you the scope of work by
- 19 the numbers. We will collect data in four seasons, like
- 20 we did in 2003. We will use the same five regions of the
- 21 states that we used before. We plan on doing 25
- 22 facilities that would be spread throughout the state.
- 23 Characterize each load by about 85 material types. And we
- 24 hope to do an estimated 750 samples, and include, again,
- 25 the three sectors.

- 1 The residential, we will look at single and
- 2 multifamily separately. We will do the overall commercial
- 3 sector and the self-haul sector, we will split into the
- 4 residential and commercial parts of that sector.
- 5 --000--
- 6 MS. CARR: Since the budget for the study is
- 7 somewhat larger than for the 2003 study, we can do a few
- 8 new things and address some special issues. One of the
- 9 tasks is to investigate methods to obtain more precise
- 10 data on special materials like tires.
- 11 These items occur infrequently in the waste stream
- 12 and we don't find them very often in our samples. So the
- 13 method we use to collect data on the main materials in the
- 14 waste stream may need to be supplemented to get better
- 15 information on these special materials. Also, sampling in
- 16 rural areas may take more effort just because there are
- 17 fewer facilities and fewer loads coming into the
- 18 facilities that are there. So we want to allow -- we want
- 19 the state so allow for more time and effort to get the
- 20 best data we can for rural areas.
- 21 We will expand our material type list to
- 22 accommodate specific data feeds. For example, you
- 23 remember -- you may remember from those slides, from the
- 24 2003 study, lumber was the number two material type
- 25 disposed. In this new study, we would split that type

- 1 into three new types -- clean dimensional lumber,
- 2 engineered wood, and painted and stained wood -- so that
- 3 we can have a better idea of how recoverable the materials
- 4 are in that category.
- 5 Also we will collect information on how divertable
- 6 the materials are that we come across in our samples, as
- 7 they are disposed at landfills.
- 8 --000--
- 9 MS. CARR: Briefly, the timeline that we
- 10 anticipate, if the Board approves the scope of work at the
- 11 Board meeting, next Tuesday the 13th, we think we can
- 12 publish the request for proposal about March 1st.
- 13 It would be out for about six weeks for people to
- 14 develop their proposals, and then we would have a couple
- 15 of weeks to evaluate them. And we anticipate coming to
- 16 the Board at the May board meeting for approval of the
- 17 contractor for the project.
- 18 Field work would begin in January 2008 so we can
- 19 accommodate all four seasons. And the final report would
- 20 be by May of 2009.
- --000--
- MS. CARR: So the staff recommendation is to
- 23 approve the scope of work for the 2007/2008 statewide
- 24 characterization study as written, in an amount up to
- 25 \$500,000, and direct staff to proceed with the secondary

- 1 request for proposal and adopt Resolution No. 2007-28.
- 2 That concludes my presentation.
- 3 Are there any questions?
- 4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Any questions for the
- 5 members?
- 6 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: You know, the '05 study,
- 7 I've never actually seen the results of that. I mean,
- 8 whenever we talk about waste characterization, we always
- 9 talk about the '03 study because it was statewide and gave
- 10 us the number.
- 11 I'm just curious, I mean, could you just very
- 12 briefly or -- I don't want to take up the time but I would
- 13 like to at least get those results because I'm curious,
- 14 like, for instance, like, commercial self-haul and C&D
- 15 were two of the four areas. Curious, how much overlap is
- 16 there? I imagine that a huge percentage of commercial
- 17 self-haul or at least a sizable percentage is C&D. So I
- 18 was just curious what we learned from the '05 study,
- 19 because we all know what we learned from the '03 study.
- 20 MS. CARR: I thought somebody might ask that
- 21 question. So I did bring some slides showing the results,
- 22 if you want to see them.
- 23 (Laughter.)
- 24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You are very good. You are
- 25 good.

- 1 MS. CARR: So I don't know if you want to take
- 2 some time to do that. So I don't know if you want to do
- 3 that or we -- yes?
- 4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Yeah sure. Go ahead.
- 5 MS. CARR: Okay.
- 6 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: We would also
- 7 be happy to come to a briefing with you, Jeff, on the
- 8 results of the '05 study.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: That would be great.
- 10 Thank you.
- 11 MEMBER BROWN: I have a question while we're
- 12 loading that.
- 13 Lorraine, you can probably answer this. I know we
- 14 are awarding the contract in May. Will it really take six
- 15 months to get all the facilities lined up, or is that part
- 16 of their preparation? I know we want to do all four
- 17 seasons, but can't we start in the fall and get the
- information a little bit sooner than '09?
- 19 MR. RUDY: If I can answer that. Tom Rudy with
- 20 the Waste Analysis Branch.
- 21 Field work is expected to start in January of '08.
- 22 That means actually going out to the landfill and
- 23 collecting --
- 24 MEMBER BROWN: -- collecting the samples.
- 25 MR. RUDY: -- the stuff. Prior to that they have

- 1 to do the study design. We have to approve the study
- 2 design. Then there's going to be the recruiting of the
- 3 sites to do that and all the logistical work that goes
- 4 along with that; recruiting the multifamily units to
- 5 sample from, those kinds of things. So they will start,
- 6 and they will get the four seasons in 2008 -- winter,
- 7 spring, summer, and fall -- and report after that.
- 8 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Yeah, I saw that in the
- 9 scope of work. And I'm just -- it will be interesting to
- 10 see the comparison with 2003. So I'm glad we're
- 11 paralleling it exactly so we can actually have some
- 12 comparable data. I didn't know it was going to take seven
- 13 months to get all of the field work and the design and all
- 14 that stuff set up.
- MS. CARR: Part of why we bumped it back to
- 16 January is because we -- if we wanted to do the fall
- 17 season, we would do it in October, so we would have
- 18 between July and October to develop everything.
- 19 Since we're doing this special task to look at
- 20 special materials, that's going to take more. And it
- 21 could be that to collect data for those materials, we need
- 22 to coordinate it with the regular field work of the
- 23 regular study. So we wanted more lead time to develop
- 24 that particular task, and since it's more of a research
- 25 task, so that we have time to develop how we're going to

- 1 collect that special data and have a it, you know, be
- 2 concurrent with the regular study.
- 3 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Thank you.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Any other questions?
- 5 Oh, I have one. I want to know if we can
- 6 structure the study so provide the Board with data to
- 7 inform our producer responsibilities strategic directive
- 8 SD5. I'm particularly interested in developing
- 9 information on u-waste, both in the disposal waste stream
- 10 and at the u-waste collection facilities. And we saw some
- 11 very interesting information yesterday from the Product
- 12 Policy Institute on the amount of product-based materials
- in the waste stream, which I thought was very telling.
- 14 I'm thinking we might want to be a little creative
- in our waste characterization study, if that's a
- 16 possibility. And if that means allocating funding --
- 17 additional funding, perhaps, from the L&G grant
- 18 application proposal, that would be fine with me.
- 19 I don't know how anybody else feels. But is that
- 20 something we could take a look at?
- 21 MS. CARR: Well, we've talked with Special Waste
- 22 staff on material types that we might want to collected
- 23 data on additional ones.
- Our normal list is 67. So that's why we put in
- 25 approximately 85, because we want to leave room for more

- 1 e-waste types or u-waste types. We don't need to
- 2 finalize --
- 3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: E-waste or u-waste? Both?
- 4 MS. CARR: Yeah.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, okay.
- 6 MS. CARR: We do four e-waste types now. But
- 7 staff said we made need to split that into finer
- 8 categories and/or add e-waste categories. We don't need
- 9 to finalize the categories. This is another thing we can
- 10 be developing during the six months' lead up to the field
- 11 work.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I think it's important that
- 13 we take a hard look at this.
- MS. CARR: Okay.
- 15 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: The special
- 16 study that Nancy is talking about would collect additional
- 17 information on the small portions of the waste stream, so
- 18 you would get additional information on what's disposed.
- 19 This study doesn't anticipate going to collectors
- 20 of the u-waste. It's looking at disposal
- 21 characterization. But we will also have additional monies
- 22 available for more waste characterization in the near
- 23 future. And we may be able to roll something in with a
- 24 sampling at collectors of the u-waste and e-waste with
- 25 that program. This is -- this is strictly a disposal

- 1 facility-based study.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I understand. The other
- 3 quick question I have was on the MRFs on the original --
- 4 the former study. Were you using samplings from dirty
- 5 MRFs and also single stream and multi-stream?
- 6 MS. CARR: Yes. We did four types of MRFs.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, you did?
- 8 MS. CARR: Yeah, which I will go through, when I
- 9 go through these slides.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. I'll be quiet now.
- 11 MEMBER CHESBRO: I have a question in terms of the
- 12 current study or proposed study, how it's presented or
- 13 analysed at the end. Are we going to focus not just on
- 14 having a snapshot of the time period, those particular
- 15 four seasons, but also the longitudinal -- what's going on
- in the waste stream, both -- and I don't know how you
- 17 could actually separate these out, but both from the
- 18 standpoint of, you know, what's changed. Because
- 19 materials are being taken out differently than they were
- 20 the last time, or previous times. And also, the changes
- 21 in the packaging stream; for example, the increase in
- 22 plastics.
- So I don't know how easy or possible it is to, in
- 24 the analysis and presentation, make it more longitudinal
- 25 and less of -- of -- I shouldn't say "less," because it's

- 1 very important to know in that moment in time what's going
- 2 on, but not just a snapshot.
- 3 MS. CARR: Yeah, that is one of the reasons why
- 4 you want to use the same method that we did in 2003, so
- 5 that the data will be correctly comparable. And we
- 6 weren't able to do that between '99 and 2003 because the
- 7 methods were different because we had different focus for
- 8 both of them.
- 9 So yeah, we will be able to look at changes in,
- 10 you know, the percentages of the material types between
- 11 the two studies.
- 12 MEMBER CHESBRO: Thanks.
- 13 MEMBER BROWN: But I think it's also -- you are
- 14 looking for more of an analysis of trends and not just
- 15 more plastic, less plastic, the types of plastic and what
- 16 that shows about the way products are changing and being
- 17 produced and developed.
- 18 So I think -- I have to agree, we need a little
- 19 bit more analytical look at it rather than just
- 20 statistical.
- 21 MS. CARR: As far as -- well, we will keep the
- 22 same material types so that we can compare the two.
- 23 As we see in something -- you know, it's something
- 24 like plastics, if we see one type going up and another
- 25 going down, then that's the way we can look at it.

- 1 MEMBER BROWN: I think it's more, when you look at
- 2 the photos the way you do, your waste characterization,
- 3 take a look at it, we want you to draw a conclusion and,
- 4 you know, just look at it and analyze to say, you know,
- 5 the amount of plastics is the same, but we're seeing
- 6 different types of plastic, whether it's plastic packaging
- 7 and not, you know -- or food plastic or just opinion.
- 8 MS. CARR: Yes. that's the fun part, actually.
- 9 MEMBER BROWN: Yeah, exactly. Not the dumpster
- 10 diving.
- 11 MS. CARR: Well, that is fun too.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Dumpster diving is a lot of
- 13 fun.
- 14 MEMBER BROWN: So I've heard.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, man. Done it.
- 16 I'm sorry. Go ahead.
- 17 MS. CARR: Okay. So I can briefly go over the
- 18 results of the 2005 study, which was the four targeted
- 19 study. So as I said before, we did selected industry
- 20 groups, residuals from MRFs, C&D waste stream, as its own
- 21 waste stream, and the self-haul and drop box waste stream.
- --000--
- MS. CARR: So instead of this being a statewide
- 24 study, we focused on the major metropolitan areas of the
- 25 state -- San Diego, L.A. areas, San Francisco Bay Area,

- 1 and the Sacramento area.
- 2 We coordinated field work for all four parts of
- 3 the study, and we collected data in two seasons -- winter
- 4 and summer season.
- 5 And we did all of the field work in 2005.
- --000--
- 7 MS. CARR: So quickly, the selected industry group
- 8 study, we looked at 378 businesses in 14 commercial
- 9 groups.
- 10 What we wanted to do was get information on not
- only what they are disposing, but what we are diverting.
- 12 So to do the diversion audit, we did phone surveys
- 13 and site visits. And also, the site visits, we collected
- 14 the disposal sample.
- 15 So during that -- those site visits, we quantified
- 16 diversion by material type. We collected and sorted
- 17 samples of the disposed waste from these businesses, and
- 18 we calculated diversion and disposal on a per employee
- 19 basis; so tons or pounds per employee for year. And we
- 20 also identified key diversion opportunities for each of
- 21 the business groups.
- 22 These are the groups we studied, briefly: light
- 23 restaurants, food stores, wholesale distributors, large
- 24 hotels, office buildings, public venues and events,
- 25 building material and garden, general retail, and shopping

- 1 malls.
- 2 --000--
- 3 MS. CARR: So the results, as I said, we got
- 4 quantities of waste disposed, pounds per employee per
- 5 year, same for waste diverted, and for the first time
- 6 waste generated. So when you put those two together, we
- 7 get the whole picture of what a business is producing.
- 8 And then we also got composition for disposal diversion
- 9 and generation and identified the opportunities for
- 10 further diversion.
- 11 --00o--
- 12 MS. CARR: Here's just an example of some of the
- 13 data. This is the amounts of waste these businesses are
- 14 generating. The blue or darker part of the bar, at the
- 15 bottom, is what they are disposing; and the lighter green
- 16 part on top is how much they are diverting in pounds per
- 17 employee per year; and the number at the top is the
- 18 diversion rate.
- 19 So you may notice food stores kind of sticking out
- 20 there. They really had a lot of diversion, mostly
- 21 cardboard. So you can kind of see, all these businesses
- 22 are diverting waste. They are diverting a pretty good
- 23 amount of waste. Some of them are really doing a lot.
- 24 Some of them have opportunities for more.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Did nobody sample any --

- 1 were the high-rise involved at all, in any of this?
- 2 MS. CARR: You mean the office buildings?
- 3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Yeah.
- 4 MS. CARR: That might not have been on that chart.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay.
- 6 MR. RUDY: I think office buildings, we did pounds
- 7 per square foot rather than per employee, because it was
- 8 too hard to determine the employees. And in a big
- 9 building, it has lots and lots of tenants. So we did by
- 10 size of building.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay.
- MS. CARR: Here's just a snapshot of part of the
- 13 data tables that we have for each of the business groups.
- 14 So we have a composition for the disposed waste,
- 15 the diverted waste, and the generated. So this is
- 16 showing, for food shore stores, paper is 18.5 percent of
- 17 the disposed waste stream. So of everything they
- 18 disposed, 18.5 percent is paper. The diverted waste
- 19 stream, 78.5 percent is paper, and it's all cardboard.
- When you combine those two streams together, you
- 21 get, for the waste that food stores are generating,
- 22 61.3 percent is paper.
- 23 So we have this detailed information for 67 --
- 24 actually, I think more than 67 material types, for 14
- 25 business groups. So we have a lot of data from this

- 1 study.
- 2 --000--
- 3 MS. CARR: Okay. On to the MRF study. We looked
- 4 at four types of MRFs, those processing single stream
- 5 materials, those processing multistream, those processing
- 6 mixed solid waste, and those processing C&D materials.
- 7 We have a detailed composition profile for each
- 8 MRF type, and we combined that together to estimate the
- 9 overall residual stream for the state. And we estimated
- 10 the tonnage produced by each MRF type statewide.
- 11 --00o--
- MS. CARR: So this is the distribution of MRFs by
- 13 type, so this is just numbers of facilities. Single
- 14 stream has the greatest number of facilities at
- 15 46 percent; mixed waste is next; then multistream; and
- 16 then C&D.
- 17 But when we look at the residual amounts, it's a
- 18 very different distribution. Mixed waste MRFs produced,
- 19 by far, the greatest amount of residual.
- Then single stream, C&D, and multistream.
- 21 --000--
- MS. CARR: And this is an example pie chart of
- 23 composition from MRFs receiving single stream recyclables.
- 24 So we have this composition pie chart for all four types
- 25 of MRFs. Then we combine all the data together to get the

- 1 overall MRF residual composition.
- 2 --000--
- 3 MS. CARR: Okay. Then the next study was detailed
- 4 characterization of C&D waste. So what we did was look
- 5 specifically at sources of C&D waste, loads from C&D
- 6 activities only.
- 7 We looked at residential and nonresidential
- 8 sources, and we looked at new construction, remodeling,
- 9 demolition, roofing, and then we had a catch-all "other"
- 10 category.
- 11 We estimated the amount disposed from each source
- 12 in the four urban areas of the study, and another thing we
- 13 did during the study was develop a visual characterization
- 14 method for the Board and also local governments to use, so
- 15 they can go out and look at their own C&D loads and
- 16 estimate what's in those loads.
- 17 --00o--
- 18 MS. CARR: So we sampled, in the four major
- 19 metropolitan areas, we did 622 loads, and we visually
- 20 estimated them, because C&D loads are really hard to sort
- 21 by hand.
- 22 And we have composition estimates for all of the
- 23 sectors that I mentioned before.
- --000--
- MS. CARR: And this is waste quantities by

- 1 activity for C&D loads. And you can get an idea of the
- 2 distribution of what's coming from all of these
- 3 activities.
- --000--
- 5 MS. CARR: And we -- in addition to looking just
- 6 at the straight composition of these loads, we kind of
- 7 grouped the materials into what -- kind of more recyclable
- 8 categories, not just specifically material categories, and
- 9 kind of got a breakdown of how recoverable these materials
- 10 are. So there's a lot of materials in these loads that is
- 11 recoverable; not that much. Just straight MSW.
- 12 --000--
- MS. CARR: Okay. And then a little bit about the
- 14 visual protocol. It's a step-by-step guide that we
- 15 produced, that local governments can get off our Web site.
- 16 We included a materials list and definition so
- 17 they know how to go out and look at the materials;
- 18 equipment list they might need; safety guidelines to
- 19 follow; we gave them sample field forms; volume to weight
- 20 conversion factors; and we also gave them a little test
- 21 they could do, to try and calibrate themselves to do
- 22 visual estimations.
- --000--
- 24 MS. CARR: And the other thing we have with that,
- 25 that I forgot to put on the slide, is we developed a tool

- 1 that's online. It's in Excel, where people can enter the
- 2 data where they go out and do their own loads, and it will
- 3 calculate their overall composition for them.
- --000--
- 5 MS. CARR: Then the last study was detailed
- 6 characterization of self-haul and drop box waste. And we
- 7 call this "other commercial self-haul," so this was
- 8 self-haul loads other than C&D. Because we characterized
- 9 all the C&D source loads in the C&D study. So we didn't
- 10 include C&D loads in this study. We looked at the other
- 11 types of loads coming from self-haulers. And we also
- 12 included drop box containers that are provided by haulers,
- 13 so it's not really a self-haul, but it's still not your
- 14 traditional packer truck waste stream.
- 15 And we characterized the materials and estimated
- 16 the amount disposed from each of the sources in the four
- 17 urban areas.
- --o0o--
- 19 MS. CARR: And we did 321 loads in the four urban
- 20 areas again. And these were hand sorted, not visually
- 21 sorted.
- 22 And we came up with estimated quantities. So they
- 23 are about the same for the four urban areas.
- 24 --000--
- MS. CARR: And then we did the composition again.

- 1 And again, besides just having the straight composition by
- 2 material type, we looked at the recoverability of the
- 3 materials. And again, found that the vast majority of the
- 4 material in these loads is recoverable.
- 5 --000--
- 6 MS. CARR: And this is the composition for the
- 7 drop box; a little bit more MSW in these types of loads.
- 8 But still, again, a lot of it is recoverable.
- 9 Okay. So that's the results kind of in a
- 10 nutshell.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Wow.
- 12 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: Can I just ask one
- 13 question? Unless you had a question; I thought you were
- 14 going to move on.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You go first.
- 16 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: I wanted to say thanks
- 17 for that. And that -- what was -- what was the percentage
- 18 of mixed waste MRFs? The dirty MRFs? I can't remember
- 19 what you said that was. That was like -- what percentage
- 20 of --
- MS. CARR: The residual tonnage?
- 22 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: No. No. I know it was
- 90 percent of the residual, but the percentage of MRFs
- 24 that are dirty performs. Was that like 20-something
- 25 percent?

28

1 MS. CARR: I probably have a slide here. 2 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: I guess -- I guess it 3 wasn't a primary function of the study. But I was curious 4 if, in the course of the study, there was any -- if you 5 had learned whether any of those communities or any of 6 those facilities were moving in another direction, whether 7 they are in the process of converting to, you know, single 8 stream or whatever, just was wondering what that trend is. Are those just dirty MRFs, or are they there to stay, or 9 are any of them transitioning or have plans to? 10 11 MS. CARR: First of all, it was 24 percent. BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: 24 percent? 12 MS. CARR: And we didn't really ask that question. 13 14 Tom went to a lot of MRFs. I don't know if you 15 got that information from --MR. RUDY: Mostly the dirty MRFs -- mostly the 16 dirty MRFs are colocated at a landfill. And what they are 17 doing is they are just throwing this stuff across the line 18 19 and pick out maybe one particular or two different types of materials that are easy to get at, like plastic bottles 20 21 or aluminum cans, or things of that nature, big tires or 22 whatever. 23 I think to find out whether people are moving to 24 single stream or multistream from those types of things

would probably be best be found in -- through our OLA

- 1 reps, I guess.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER DANZINGER: That's just a broader
- 3 question then. I mean, it just sort of struck me, in 24
- 4 percent of the facilities, 90 percent of the residual. I
- 5 can appreciate the cost involved. But these are
- 6 dinosaurs.
- 7 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: One of the
- 8 issues that we did have with this MRF study is we rely on
- 9 voluntary cooperation for all of our activities here. And
- 10 we got very limited cooperation in terms of the MRFs on
- 11 this study.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: So -- and limited
- 13 cooperation. We had a to pull teeth to go to go do this?
- 14 That's exactly what happened; right?
- 15 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: In
- 16 determining -- in determining the mix of what everyone out
- 17 there was doing, we got very limited cooperation.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: We talked about this
- 19 before.
- 20 ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR VAN KEKERIX: Very good
- 21 cooperation from people who actually invited us to come
- 22 and sample. But in terms of the -- what the overall
- 23 make-up of MRFs was, there was very limited cooperation.
- 24 MEMBER BROWN: I think that people who run dirty
- 25 MRFs believe that their recovery rate is much higher than

- 1 it probably is. So they don't want to know what they
- 2 don't want to know.
- 3 MEMBER CHESBRO: Lorraine, is that -- does that
- 4 affect the result? I mean, how sure can you be that your
- 5 sampling is representative, if folks are not cooperating
- 6 or providing access?
- 7 MS. CARR: I think it did affect the results.
- 8 What we wanted to do -- they're kind of two parts --
- 9 MEMBER CHESBRO: Can we correct for that?
- MS. CARR: What?
- 11 MEMBER CHESBRO: Is there a way to correct for
- 12 that?
- MS. CARR: Well, we could find a way to make them
- 14 report to us. I don't know.
- 15 MEMBER CHESBRO: I just meant statistically --
- MS. CARR: Statistically -- there were two parts
- 17 of the study. One was the sampling, which we did find
- 18 enough facilities that were actually very hospitable to
- 19 help us do our sampling.
- 20 The other part of the study was surveying. We
- 21 really wanted to do a census of all the MRFs in the state,
- 22 so we had identified as many MRFs as we could and sent our
- 23 surveys out and repeatedly called to try and get the
- 24 survey information from these facilities, and didn't get
- 25 much response.

- 1 So what we did was, with the responses that we
- 2 got, we kind of had to assume that was representative and
- 3 extrapolate it.
- 4 We originally wanted to really have data for all
- 5 the facilities or at least the vast majority of
- 6 facilities, and have it actually be like a measurement
- 7 rather than extrapolation. But we weren't able to do
- 8 that.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Evan, I have a question for
- 10 you.
- 11 So can you help us out a little bit with what's
- 12 gone on and where we're going here and there's a way we
- 13 can get, like, maybe some adjustments, not just
- 14 statistically, but we're trying to figure out what's going
- on here, especially where we are going in the industry,
- 16 running away from landfills.
- 17 MR. EDGAR: Evan Edgar on behalf of the CRRC.
- 18 We are promoting a MRF-first policy, definitely.
- 19 And to answer Mr. Danzinger's question, there are some
- 20 dirty MRFs going to clean MRFs down in Rainbow, down in
- 21 Orange County. We just got done with that transition last
- 22 year. So more of those non-landfill-based dirty MRFs are
- 23 going towards a clean, single-stream MRF. So the trend
- 24 within industry is definitely going single stream.
- 25 And I tried, with your staff, to reach out, to

- 1 the --
- 2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Evan, you can talk anybody
- 3 into anything.
- 4 MR. EDGAR: I'm now going through a lot of
- 5 permitting of some of these recycling centers that were
- 6 less than 10 percent residual. As you get into more
- 7 commericial single stream, the residual waste goes up. So
- 8 a lot of the facilities out there are pushing the ten
- 9 percent limit, less than even the full permit.
- 10 I'm bringing a lot of those facilities, that are
- 11 going into commercial single-stream into a full permit.
- 12 So those facilities be more willing to come forward
- 13 with -- they are good on sampling, as you noticed. When
- 14 it comes to sampling the waste stream, they are right
- 15 there, every one of them. But regardless of the MRF
- 16 survey, about what they are doing, they weren't as willing
- 17 to come forth, because a lot of facilities that were
- 18 recycling centers are becoming full MRFs. Those people
- 19 would be more willing to come forward as we have more MRF
- 20 first policies come into play.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: All right. Great.
- 22 MR. EDGAR: But I do have follow-up testimony
- 23 about the -- I was going to talk about the waste
- 24 characterization really quick.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Fire away.

- 1 MR. EDGAR: It's great for policy development and
- 2 program design.
- 3 Being the engineer for the California Refuse
- 4 Removal Council, we help with a lot of business
- 5 development and policy development. So these studies are
- 6 great. And we totally endorse them. But what you saw
- 7 today, as part of the waste stream is number 1 was food,
- 8 and number two was lumber. And that lumber thing is
- 9 really disturbing. We have almost 4 million tons of
- 10 lumber going into the landfill today. We have a lot of
- 11 C&D ordinances that were around, back in early '00. I
- 12 would like to see the focus on lumber. I think that what
- 13 Nancy presented was four different types of lumber.
- 14 It would be nice to talk about treated wood waste.
- 15 About 10 percent of the lumber is treated wood waste and
- 16 that has been designed to go into a Subtitle D landfill
- 17 unit, and will continue to do so.
- 18 But the other 90 percent is highly recyclable.
- 19 And the big question right now: What happens to that
- 20 lumber? There's a sector of the solid waste industry,
- 21 would love to take lumber and sequester it in the landfill
- 22 and get carbon credits. And that would be a green
- 23 landfill with landfill gas caps and closures. Be a very
- 24 safe landfill. And it's good technology. That would be a
- 25 green landfill. Or you can take the same 4 million tons

- 1 and make green energy. So you have green energy, green
- 2 landfills. And you got 4 million tons of lumber.
- 3 That will be the policy debate this year with
- 4 regards to AB 32 in the context of what can be sequestered
- 5 in a landfill and get carbon credits and what should go
- 6 towards a renewable portfolio standard to get green energy
- 7 credits. So I'm glad to see the focus on lumber. It's a
- 8 number two stream out there.
- 9 And I think that this will be the year with a
- 10 renewed debate and characterization when you look at the
- 11 trend analysis. Because over the -- from '99 to '03 to
- 12 '07, we have a neat trend analysis on the longitudinal
- 13 path, that Mr. Chesbro pointed out, is very important to
- 14 see how successful you are on diverting wood from
- 15 landfills.
- MEMBER CHESBRO: So is the idea that putting wood
- 17 in a landfill is sequestering based on the idea that it
- 18 will break down very slowly?
- 19 MR. EDGAR: Biogenic, CO2. A lot of science
- 20 there. And you can promote the science with a lot of
- 21 Google tests every day to promote them. But it doesn't
- 22 pass the giggle test in my book with regards to, does it
- 23 make good policy.
- 24 MEMBER CHESBRO: So you weren't suggesting that.
- 25 You were just -- I'm sorry. Okay.

- 1 MR. EDGAR: I'm not saying that's what some people
- 2 are trying to position themselves forward, to have the
- 3 landfill to be painted green with sequestered carpet. And
- 4 science could be there. And I'm sure there would be a
- 5 great play to look at that. But I believe the formal
- 6 lengths should work to go toward green energy and not
- 7 green landfills.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Evan -- I'm sorry. Evan,
- 9 one other question: On the deconstruct side, and I'm
- 10 thinking more on the Southern California area, have you
- 11 guys looked at anything to do with deconstructed shipping,
- 12 basically recovered lumber in New Mexico, and how much of
- 13 that is going on?
- MR. EDGAR: We're more the biomass energy market.
- 15 And we make the woodchips for the green energy in the
- 16 state.
- 17 A whole nother sector, the good sector, do the
- 18 deconstruction and strip the metals and the wood, so
- 19 that's great business. But the sector of the work is
- 20 bringing back the biomass energy plants in California.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: All right. Thank you.
- MR. EDGAR: You're welcome.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: All right.
- Any other questions? Comments? Nancy?
- MS. CARR: No, I don't have anything else if you

- 1 don't have any more questions.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great.
- 3 With that, do I hear a motion?
- 4 MEMBER BROWN: That would mean that I move
- 5 Resolution 2007-28.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Hear a second?
- 7 MEMBER CHESBRO: Second.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Seconded by Member Chesbro.
- 9 And Deb?
- 10 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Brown?
- 11 MEMBER BROWN: Aye.
- 12 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Chesbro?
- MEMBER CHESBRO: Aye.
- 14 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?
- 15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.
- 16 That's on fiscal consent.
- Okay. Before we take up the WRAP award item --
- 18 oh, no.
- John, you are up for your report.
- 20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Deputy director's report,
- 21 and then there will be two items.
- 22 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay.
- 23 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Good morning, Chairman
- 24 Petersen, Committee Members Brown and Chesbro, and
- 25 welcome, our Board Member Danzinger.

- I have a few items in my deputy director report.
- 2 And then we will proceed on to the two agenda items for
- 3 this division.
- 4 The first topic relates to identifying feed stock
- 5 for a recycling manufacturer. On January 24th, RMDZ
- 6 staff, Lisa Barry along with Andrew Hurst of Cal/EPA;
- 7 Office of Local Assistance Staff, Yasmin Satter and
- 8 Natalie Lee participated in a regional meeting at Tiburon
- 9 Manufacturing Facility located in Stockton.
- 10 This meeting was hosted by the San Joaquin County,
- 11 Department of Public Works, and attended by the recycling
- 12 coordinators in the region as well as representatives from
- waste management.
- 14 The goal of the meeting was to identify viable
- 15 polystyrene collection strategies that would solve the
- 16 growing problem in the region and assist Tiburon with that
- 17 particular business in identifying additional feed stock.
- 18 Options under serious consideration included a
- 19 one-day polystyrene collection event coupled with other
- 20 existing collection events; having contract haulers work
- 21 with Tiburon to divert material from the commercial
- 22 sector; having jurisdictions work with the business
- 23 community to develop drop-off collection opportunities.
- 24 The group acknowledged that there are challenges
- 25 to address, such as transportation and more efficient ways

- 1 to transport this bulky material. This was the first of
- 2 many meetings and a good start in opening dialogue on a
- 3 regional level.
- 4 Second, Recycling Expo, or REXPO III, with the
- 5 assistance of our public affairs office, staff and the
- 6 various Board programs participated in this year's REXPO.
- 7 The Board had exhibits, like the recycled store,
- 8 that focused on buying green. Other exhibits addressed
- 9 Board resources dealing with organics, and procurement
- 10 resources for local governments, ag plastic recycling, and
- 11 farm and ranch cleanup grants.
- 12 Several staff participated in panel discussions.
- 13 Our own Rich Hicks gave a presentation on the RCP database
- 14 and how that information would help buy green. Corky Mau,
- 15 Christine Flowers, Lisa Barry, and Pat Paswater presented
- 16 information about a variety of Board programs and tailored
- 17 resources that are available to local governments and the
- 18 agricultural community.
- 19 Although this year's attention was slightly
- 20 smaller than in previous years, we were successful in
- 21 landing some new business leads for the RMDZ program and
- 22 for future ag projects.
- 23 Staff had a fruitful dialogue with San Joaquin
- 24 Department of Public Works, UC Cooperative Extension, San
- 25 Joaquin County, Blue Diamond Almond Growers, and the Farm

- 1 Bureau.
- 2 Lastly, on behalf of the event coordinator, Frank
- 3 Farrell, one of our most active zone administrators, I
- 4 thank you, Board Chair Brown, for your participation at
- 5 this event.
- 6 The last -- the last item. E-waste net cost
- 7 report training. E-waste program collects cost
- 8 information from all SB 20 payment system participants.
- 9 Board staff and its contractor, Humboldt State and R.W.
- 10 Beck scheduled two Web-based training. The first was held
- 11 January 31st, and 85 attended. The second is taking place
- 12 today, with a projected number of 70 to participate.
- Of the 85 participating in the first event,
- 14 approximately 20 were from local governments; five from
- 15 nonprofits; and the balance representing businesses and
- 16 recyclers in the e-waste program.
- 17 The data gleaned from the net cost reports help
- 18 inform Board staff and Board members about the two costs,
- 19 to collect and recycle covered electronic waste in the
- 20 state.
- 21 Staff will analyze reports in order to make
- 22 recommendations to the Board, concerning any necessary
- 23 adjustments to the advance recycling fee and the recovery
- 24 and recycling payment rate.
- 25 Program staff plans to bring findings and

1 recommendations to the Board in May or June regarding any

- 2 adjustments.
- 3 And that's all I have for my report.
- 4 Are there any questions?
- 5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Questions?
- I have a question.
- 7 On the Tiburon and what they are doing on the
- 8 recycling polystyrene --
- 9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Right.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: -- how their collection
- 11 program, how are they getting the materials? And this is
- 12 mostly from industrial sources; correct?
- 13 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: It's coming from
- 14 primarily -- right. Industrial and commercial sources.
- 15 And they actually go and collect it from those sources.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: And are they having any
- 17 problems with -- in their process with the FR, the fire
- 18 retardency, that's on the electronic styrenes, the
- 19 packaging --
- 20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: No, they don't have any
- 21 problems with that, no. The problem they have is just
- 22 getting enough -- enough material. Part of the issue is
- 23 it's just so bulky. Although there are densifiers that
- 24 you can take to the site and densify the material.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: So they are concentrating

- 1 on big boxes and places like that; right?
- 2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: And our staff is working
- 3 and trying to identify --
- 4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's a tough one.
- 5 MEMBER BROWN: That's a great product. Did you
- 6 go?
- 7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: No, but even I have seen
- 8 their product and it's a great product. They have to find
- 9 something to do with that stuff. It's amazing. So there
- 10 are the guys who are doing it in town; right?
- 11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Yes.
- 12 MEMBER BROWN: I think most of their collection is
- 13 in northern California. They are trying to get it from
- 14 Southern California. But when they get the densifier down
- 15 there, it's still so expensive to haul it back up here.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: So we have to colocate
- 17 another plant.
- 18 MEMBER BROWN: I was going to say, Southern
- 19 California, RMDZ loan.
- 20 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: And I want to put it in
- 21 Santa Barbara; okay?
- MEMBER BROWN: Well, have they gotten their
- 23 business that they need to get this cycle? Okay. Good.
- 24 Let's go to Santa Barbara.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I think that would be a

- 1 perfect place, downtown.
- 2 MEMBER BROWN: Before you got here, Gary put his
- 3 tail on the line to help them get a business into their
- 4 zone.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: They wanted to put it next
- 6 to the county building; okay?
- 7 Anyway, thank you, John.
- 8 We'll move on.
- 9 MEMBER BROWN: I have a question: REXPO --
- 10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Yes.
- 11 MEMBER BROWN: I would like to sort of have a
- 12 sit-down chat with those people who found it to be
- 13 extremely beneficial.
- 14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Okay.
- 15 MEMBER BROWN: It was extremely ag focused. There
- 16 was very low attendance when I was there and it just does
- 17 not seem to be focusing on the recycling as much as the
- 18 ag. I mean, I think our display and our staff did a great
- 19 job. I just don't know whether it's the best place and
- 20 whether they are trying to bridge the focus to recycling
- 21 and ag, but it was all tractors and ag and it was very
- 22 heavy equipment. It really wasn't -- I think we got lost
- 23 in the whole thing.
- 24 And I wonder if, you know, it's a good use of our
- 25 time.

- 1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: We are going to
- 2 carefully -- Corky Mau kind of lead the activities, kind
- 3 of doing some analysis on this, and whether this is the
- 4 right thing or attend at the level. I know Frank Farrell
- 5 has been trying very hard --
- 6 MEMBER BROWN: He's great.
- 7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: In fact, he created this
- 8 REXPO. He's been trying very hard to expand it to other
- 9 businesses other than ag. And, you know, but we'll
- 10 carefully look at it, because it takes a lot of resources
- 11 to get the stuff down there, all the coordinating and
- 12 stuff.
- MEMBER BROWN: Well, and just the amount of staff
- 14 that you said participated in all of their sessions. And
- 15 you know, I hope it's not a reflection of me, but I think
- 16 there was, like, 20 people at the opening session.
- 17 So it really wasn't -- I don't know. Maybe what
- 18 we do is, we look at boosting it so that it does focus
- 19 more on the recycling, or whether the opportunity is to
- 20 bring in another partner. Because I know the --
- 21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: We'll definitely have some
- 22 conversations with Frank and the other people who are
- 23 involved and those that, like you said, got a significant
- 24 benefit out of it, and get back with you.
- 25 MEMBER BROWN: Great. Thanks, John.

- 1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Thank you.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Any other comments
- 3 or questions?
- 4 Okay.
- 5 Consideration of the Recycling Market Development
- 6 Revolving Loan Program Application for Desert Solutions.
- 7 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Okay. The presenter today
- 8 will be Govindan Viswanathan. We also have Stan Warshaw,
- 9 who's the representative from Desert Solutions, to answer
- 10 any specific questions you have from the presentation.
- 11 Mr. Viswanathan: Good morning, Committee Chair
- 12 and members of the Committee.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good morning.
- 14 Mr. Viswanathan: This agenda item presents for
- 15 consideration Desert Solutions, Inc.'s application to the
- 16 Recycling Market Development Revolving Loan Program. The
- 17 applicant's 20-acre recycling facility is located in
- 18 Cathedral City, within the Riverside County RMDZ.
- 19 The loan request is for \$1,809,000 and is to fund
- 20 capital improvements, purchase new compost turner
- 21 equipment and loan fee.
- Desert Solutions is projecting to divert 65,000
- 23 tons of green waste and hire eight employees. The fully
- 24 enclosed facility, consisting of long aerated concrete
- 25 channels, will use in-vessel agitated composting

- 1 technology to convert green waste to organic compost and
- 2 top soil. The system is equipped with bio filters.
- 3 Leachate collected will be recycled and reused. Feedstock
- 4 will include grass cuttings, shrubbery, tree trimmings,
- 5 palm fronds, ground wood chips, food waste from
- 6 restaurants, and construction and demolition material such
- 7 as dry wall for gypsum and discarded construction wood.
- 8 The project is sited approximately quarter mile from the
- 9 Edom Hill Transfer Station. Cathedral City, under the
- 10 permit arrangement, has agreed to direct all the city's
- 11 green waste and food waste to the proposed facility.
- 12 On August 16, 2005, the Board had approved a loan
- 13 in the amount of \$1,312,500 to Desert Solutions. The loan
- 14 was not funded at the time. The delay was due to the
- 15 increase in construction cost, cost of construction
- 16 materials and the cost of the compost turning machine.
- 17 The RMDZ Loan Committee met on February 1, 2007,
- 18 and had approved this loan request.
- 19 The applicant has over 10 years' experience in
- 20 running a sand mining operation, as well as green waste
- 21 recycling, in Long Island, New York. The East Coast
- 22 business sells mulch, top soil, and road base to
- 23 nurseries, large private estates, landscapers and road
- 24 pavers.
- Desert Hot Springs, Rancho Mirage, Palm Springs,

- 1 Palm Desert, and Cathedral City are targeted markets for
- 2 DSI. End users are farmers, nurseries, professional
- 3 landscapers, and golf courses.
- 4 Staff recommends that the Committee approve Option
- 5 No. 1 and adopt Resolution No. 2007-39 to approve a RMDZ
- 6 loan to Desert Solutions, Inc.
- 7 Stan Warshaw, of Desert Solutions is here to
- 8 answer any questions the Committee may have on this
- 9 project.
- Thank you.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Questions?
- 12 MEMBER CHESBRO: I have question, Mr. Chairman.
- 13 And maybe the representative of the company could come up,
- 14 forward.
- 15 First of all, I'm excited that we're helping to
- 16 site compost facilities. So you know, my questions are
- 17 not critical of that. That's a high priority for this
- 18 Board, and it's exciting to be able to help make it
- 19 happen.
- 20 But I do note a couple things from the agenda
- 21 item. One is that the previous operator there had failed.
- 22 And I don't know any of the history, and I don't want to
- 23 go into it in detail. But it raises some question, in my
- 24 mind. And also, that I believe at least some part of the
- 25 revenue that's proposed would come from tipping fees or

47

1 from sharing funds with the city that had to do with

- 2 collection and the cost of people dropping off the
- 3 material.
- 4 I'm interested in knowing, from a sustainable
- 5 standpoint, and economic sustainable standpoint, to what
- 6 degree have you pinned down end uses and markets that will
- 7 actually pay for the compost to help support it, so that
- 8 we don't have a failed facility in the future?
- 9 MR. WARSHAW: Good morning. Thank you, Chair and
- 10 Committee. My name is Stan Warshaw. It's a family
- 11 business. We do our business in New York and we're
- 12 finishing -- we have it's almost like having it in, like
- 13 you said, in Santa Barbara. We have it in the Hamptons.
- 14 We mine. We have about a hundred acres out there. We
- 15 have family out here. And the reason we got involved many
- 16 years ago was the opportunity, even though your
- 17 regulations are very tough, if we do it in a different
- 18 way, they are feasible.
- 19 This is a new type of way of doing it. Santa Rosa
- 20 does this in their in-vessel facility. Now their biggest
- 21 problem is electric. Their turn is electric. And because
- 22 of that, their electric costs are outrageous, and they
- 23 can't make a dollar -- no matter what the price is --
- 24 their number per dollar.
- 25 Our particular system runs on a diesel motor with

48

1 special bio filters that we bring it, and that will

- 2 actually take everything out.
- 3 And diesel runs a lot more economically and will
- 4 turn it faster by the aeration, the whole system. It's
- 5 going to be composted into channels, and it's an enclosed
- 6 building. That's why it costs so much. But part of the
- 7 cost is the whole property. We had to cleanup the
- 8 property of White Feather, and that's how we got into it
- 9 with the town of Cathedral City. They are only talking a
- 10 dollar from our fee, and fees are going up.
- 11 The next major thing we can do, we can do palm
- 12 fronds, which has become a disaster to get rid of, in burn
- 13 plants or anywhere else.
- 14 The particular gentleman I'm working with, John
- 15 Paul, Dr. John Paul, is out of Canada. His systems have
- 16 been in Canada and they are now in China. He's also been
- 17 in contact with Malaysia on rubber plants. They have the
- 18 same problem. He can do palm fronds.
- 19 The system can be boutiqued in a sense that I
- 20 use -- I can use up to 50 percent food waste once we get
- 21 the system down. So supermarkets, single source
- 22 operations like, you know, cafeterias, where they don't
- 23 put the plastic in, if they separate, just like they do in
- 24 San Francisco, you can do this on both, because we have it
- 25 available in the Valley.

- 1 And I can mix the food waste in, which is also
- 2 more economical and gives more nitrogen.
- 3 Getting rid of the material is the quality of the
- 4 compost. It will be high nitrogen. I can mix within the
- 5 system. So it has sprinklers, it has heaters. It comes
- 6 out of the system in 28 days and it has to cure. But it
- 7 goes through the whole system in 28 days, which normally
- 8 can take 90 days to six months in the old way of doing it.
- 9 We will do outside grind -- we will do grinding
- 10 and send it to Comax on the material. But a lot of the
- 11 material in the valley is shrubbery. Shrubbery from the
- 12 golf courses from the all the gated communities, and its
- 13 landscaping material and grass. That's easily composed.
- 14 It's about the quality. We have a hundred golf
- 15 courses. Other than Myrtle Beach, I don't know of a place
- in the United States that has a hundred golf courses. It
- 17 has the amount of -- have to save on water and don't want
- 18 pesticides. Compost done in the right things will give
- 19 them the draw back of pesticides.
- 20 MEMBER CHESBRO: And have they shown a
- 21 commitment -- have those golf courses shown a commitment
- 22 to --
- MR. WARSHAW: They show it, because you have to
- 24 make the product. It's a matter of, do you build it?
- 25 They will come. They will do it, if the product is right.

- 1 We have the capability of making the product because of
- 2 the way it's made.
- 3 MEMBER CHESBRO: So is landscaping of golf courses
- 4 and other settings the primary end use that you are
- 5 envisioning?
- 6 MR. WARSHAW: To start with. That's without
- 7 bagging. We don't even consider bagging. We feel that
- 8 right -- because the quality --
- 9 MEMBER CHESBRO: Bulk use by landscaping, those
- 10 who do formal landscaping is the primary --
- 11 MR. WARSHAW: The major -- you know, the other
- 12 problem we have in the desert is we have no topsoil. We
- 13 have more compost than topsoil. You have to mix topsoil.
- 14 You need a mix of it; you got to use dirt and sand to mix
- 15 it. But it's unheard of to find enough of it.
- 16 MEMBER CHESBRO: What proportion of the revenue do
- 17 you anticipate coming from the -- up front?
- MR. WARSHAW: 75 percent, at least.
- 19 MEMBER CHESBRO: Okay. And then --
- 20 MR. WARSHAW: Of course, the fees have gone up
- 21 over the years.
- 22 MEMBER CHESBRO: Okay.
- 23 MR. WARSHAW: And the other thing that I did and
- 24 the reason we didn't go through with the other loan, I
- 25 took this loan first and went to the bank. I went back to

1 the bank, and the bank gave it up first. They were

- 2 already in place. And I worked out the building cost,
- 3 because two years ago, the building boom in the valley was

- 4 incredible. I couldn't get anybody to -- everything was
- 5 just -- between the oil and everything, nobody wanted to
- 6 do it. The prices were even worse what they could be.
- 7 MEMBER CHESBRO: We so need to site compost
- 8 facilities that -- I think this needs to move forward, but
- 9 I think one of my mantras is that collection and
- 10 processing is not recycling till the material has been
- 11 removed and a viable reuse, a sustainable reuse, has been
- 12 established.
- 13 So obviously we have a loan committee. We have a
- 14 staff. You have a bank that you go through. So I'm not
- 15 in a position to doubt or question the viability of the
- 16 business, but I think that it's important for us to -- as
- 17 we make these loans to strongly push the focus on
- 18 increasing the high value end use as the ultimate way to
- 19 support these things.
- 20 MR. WARSHAW: There are a whole bunch of other
- 21 ways. But if I go into it, it's just speculation.
- 22 There's composting. That's granulation. There's things,
- 23 if I tell you, that if I granulate the right product, it
- 24 goes from \$200 a yard. But those are just in the sky.
- 25 But they are paying that. But I can't put that on the

- 1 table, because I really have to make the product. But
- 2 it's capable of making a product and going into another
- 3 phase to -- a bulk granulation is a very major business.
- 4 And it's not a very expensive business to get into. And
- 5 naturally, there's always bagging, but that's not really
- 6 what I'm trying to do. I'm trying to first get into this
- 7 part of it. It is family. We own 20 acres. It's not
- 8 like we're worried about failing. If we fail, you get
- 9 paid. I mean, that part is -- it's not going to be.
- 10 MEMBER CHESBRO: Well, and actually I'm less
- 11 concerned about -- even though I want viable loans
- 12 obviously, I'm less concerned about that than
- 13 establishing, you know, viable economics in the long term
- 14 for composting and recycling.
- 15 MR. WARSHAW: You know, other than Mary Mataba
- 16 [phonetic], she's going into a geotech system, the amount
- of money involved in these systems, because of the new
- 18 laws, it's a twofold thing. Do you do the laws and not
- 19 the emissions and get the product? We're in this part of
- 20 it. This will be the way it will go, because otherwise no
- 21 one will be able to compost.
- 22 MEMBER CHESBRO: Well, that's the other positive
- 23 thing that you're demonstrating. You're demonstrating the
- 24 capability to site composting in a -- it's not an urban
- 25 setting in the sense that Los Angeles or Orange County

- 1 are, but it's a very exclusive setting and one that I
- 2 think, demonstrating that you can do it there, is very
- 3 positive.
- 4 MR. WARSHAW: Well, it's easy, because the
- 5 20 acres we have are right next to the landfill and they
- 6 own 300 acres around there. There are certain -- we
- 7 understand that back in the East Coast, they are not as
- 8 far as you, and they need composting because they get
- 9 tremendous leaves. That's the other problem on the East
- 10 Coast. They have a seasonal business. Now for three
- 11 months, there is no product. So no matter what you
- 12 charge, you can't -- other than food, but you need carbon
- 13 to go into the food, so you got to stockpile it. They
- 14 can't do it. Nor do they have the ability -- nobody wants
- 15 it in their backyard. That's why it's so -- you know,
- 16 it's a reason.
- 17 MEMBER CHESBRO: And that's what I meant by the
- 18 importance of demonstrating what can be done --
- MR. WARSHAW: Yes.
- 20 MEMBER CHESBRO: You know, someplace other than a
- 21 hundred miles from anybody else.
- MR. WARSHAW: Actually, we're fives miles from
- 23 anybody else. We're on a hill in a mountain, and that was
- 24 one of the reasons --
- 25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: That's still close.

- 1 MEMBER CHESBRO: But if you tried to put it on a
- 2 hill or a mountain, a lot of places in the L.A. Basin --
- 3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Forget it.
- 4 MEMBER CHESBRO: -- five miles from anybody, the
- 5 people are still doing to say that it's going to poison
- 6 them somehow.
- 7 MR. WARSHAW: If it works the way we are, the bio
- 8 filters do everything in the closed building, you will be
- 9 able to site it at much closer areas.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: This is great. And I'm
- 11 really excited about this. Good stuff.
- 12 MR. WARSHAW: But it's been a long time. And the
- 13 first time, we filled out 60 pages for the LEA. The last
- 14 time, we just did 210 pages. I mean --
- 15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: You're an expert now.
- MR. WARSHAW: My people are an expert. But we're
- 17 persistent. And I think it will be --
- 18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I just thank you and
- 19 congratulations and we look forward to working with you
- 20 and watching how this happens.
- 21 MEMBER CHESBRO: Mr. Chair, if there's no other
- 22 comments or testimony, I would be happy to move Resolution
- 23 2007-39.
- MEMBER BROWN: Second.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb?

55 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Brown? 1 2 MEMBER BROWN: Aye. EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Chesbro? 3 4 MEMBER CHESBRO: Aye. 5 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen? 6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye. Thank you all very much. DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: Fiscal consent? 8 9 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, yes. Let's put it 10 there. 11 MEMBER BROWN: And when you get it up and running, I would like to see it. 12 13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: We want to come see. 14 Okay. Okay. Okay. Before we take -- any questions or anything? 15 Before we take up the WRAP award item, I would 16 17 like to indicate that I will not be participating in the discussion of this item nor voting on it. I have 18 19 discovered that I may have a potential conflict of 20 interest regarding one or more of the award recipients, 21 and therefore in the abundance of caution, I am causing -recusing myself from participating in this item. 22 23 I will be leaving the dais during the consideration, and I would ask that Margo -- Chairman 24 25 Margo Brown take over, running the meeting, during the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

- 1 duration of this item.
- 2 But before I turn over the gavel, I want to say
- 3 that from my own personal experience, the importance of a
- 4 recognition program such as a WRAP award cannot be
- 5 overstated.
- 6 California's private business community continues
- 7 to voluntarily step up and participate in this program
- 8 with remarkable waste diversion and accomplishments. I
- 9 feel strongly that meaningful recognition of these efforts
- 10 should be ongoing, part of the public outreach of this
- 11 Board. It's really important. The industry loves doing
- 12 this stuff. And it's a cross-check for us to proliferate
- 13 what we want to have happen and where our directions are.
- So thereafter, Margo?
- 15 MEMBER BROWN: Thank you. Thank you.
- I think we can go directly to the item.
- John, if you have an introduction before this one?
- DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: No, we can go directly to
- 19 the item.
- 20 MEMBER BROWN: Okay.
- 21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SMITH: And Piper Miguelgorry will
- 22 be the presenter.
- MEMBER BROWN: Piper, go ahead.
- MS. MIGUELGORRY: Thank you. Good morning, Mr.
- 25 Chair, as he leaves, and Board members.

57 This item is Consideration of the 2006 Waste 1 2 Reduction Awards Program Winners and WRAP of the Year 3 Winners. 4 And I will do a very brief slide presentation. 5 Most of you are very much aware of the content of this 6 item and the program itself, so I'm going to be very 7 brief. 8 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.) 9 10 --000--11 MS. MIGUELGORRY: About WRAP; WRAP provides an opportunity to businesses to gain public recognition for 12 13 their outstanding efforts. All businesses and private 14 nonprofit organizations are encouraged to apply. This is 15 secluded primarily to businesses and nonprofit organizations due to the fact they are voluntary efforts, 16 17 as they assist the cities and counties statewide to meet 18 their diversion goals. --000--19 MS. MIGUELGORRY: Facts are: Since 1993, the WRAP 20 21 program has honored over 15,350 businesses, at close of this year, as proposed winners. And we are proposing 22 23 1,254 WRAP business winners and five WRAP of the Year awards. Separate category. Very fortunately, 52 counties 24

out of the 58 statewide are represented with our WRAP

- 1 winning business list here, that is attached with your
- 2 item.
- 3 And there are approximately 1.2 million tons that
- 4 have been diverted, they have told us, in their
- 5 applications, with an approximate cost savings of
- 6 \$112 million.
- 7 --000--
- 8 MS. MIGUELGORRY: Just to briefly talk about the
- 9 WRAP of the Year category, this is an exemplary category
- 10 of businesses from the regular WRAP winning list, that, as
- 11 a Committee, we have selected what we feel are exemplary
- 12 businesses within their own industry. And we also feel we
- do a great job of covering the state in terms of counties
- 14 and in terms of multiple sites and individual facilities.
- This year, we have selected Interior Removal
- 16 Specialist from South Gate, Los Angeles; NUMI, which is in
- 17 Oakland, Alameda County; Pacific Builders in Humboldt
- 18 County; Seton Medical Center, Coastside -- I'm sure you
- 19 are familiar with the hospitals -- in Santa Mateo County;
- 20 and of course, Toyota Motor Sales, which is a very special
- 21 business, along with the others, in Torrance, Los Angeles
- 22 County.
- 23 And interestingly enough, we also seem to find one
- 24 in L.A. County. Seems like not only are they one of the
- 25 largest counties in the state obviously, but they also

- 1 have a great participation in terms of the WRAP program.
- 2 I will entertain any questions that you may have.
- 3 I am -- I might want to state, I am no longer the
- 4 program coordinator. We have selected a new person. I'm
- 5 now working in the Office of Local Assistance, Bay Area
- 6 Section. So I'm pleased to be able to bring my knowledge
- 7 about the WRAP program to that effort.
- 8 MEMBER BROWN: Great. Thank you.
- 9 MEMBER CHESBRO: No questions, but I have a
- 10 comment. I would like to echo and add to the Chair's
- 11 earlier -- Committee Chair's early comments about the
- 12 program.
- But also the thing that he didn't mention in
- 14 detail was how involvement -- entry into the WRAP program,
- 15 by a business, because of their pride or some individual
- 16 thing they have done, leads to a much broader analysis and
- 17 an educational opportunity for those businesses then to
- 18 become involved in a whole array of sustainability
- 19 activities, and involving waste and beyond; going to, you
- 20 know, energy conservation and global warming issues and
- 21 alternative energy and a whole other array of things,
- 22 because they -- I think it's a step-by-step process, one
- 23 thing leads to another.
- 24 As businesses become aware, it's both good for
- 25 their morale, their employees, and for their image with

- 1 their customers and their community, and also for the
- 2 bottom line, in most cases, if not all cases. I think it
- 3 has just an ever growing benefit within those businesses.
- 4 And I'm really amazed and impressed that -- I
- 5 don't want to you to go back now and tell me, but I would
- 6 be really interested in knowing what some of these
- 7 businesses that we were giving WRAP awards to, ten years
- 8 ago, and I have to assume that they have -- they
- 9 didn't just -- they are not being awarded for staying
- 10 still, that they started with some activities back in the
- 11 '90s and they are continuing to grow and expand the
- 12 activities that they are engaged in, that involve becoming
- 13 more environmentally sustainable, for the people of the
- 14 state of California.
- MS. MIGUELGORRY: Absolutely.
- 16 MEMBER CHESBRO: Anyway, I echo the strong
- 17 statement of support for the program and welcome the
- 18 opportunity to award -- grant these awards.
- MS. MIGUELGORRY: Thank you.
- 20 MEMBER BROWN: I agree.
- 21 I think what's interesting is, there is at least a
- 22 couple businesses on here that have obviously shown it's
- 23 in their culture. And 527 locations of Safeway stores
- 24 actually have received -- I think that's probably the
- 25 record. There's 79 locations in Southern California

- 1 Edison and 127 locations for Save Mart Supermarkets.
- 2 So hopefully, their corporate culture is going to
- 3 help them help us in other programs that don't -- that
- 4 aren't part of the WRAP, specifically 2449.
- 5 But anyway, I agree, I think it's a great program
- 6 for businesses to start becoming aware of how they,
- 7 individually, can make a difference in their community and
- 8 in their business.
- 9 So with that --
- 10 MEMBER CHESBRO: I will move -- what's the --
- 11 MEMBER BROWN: You move. I second.
- 12 MEMBER CHESBRO: I move the Resolution 2007-40.
- 13 And I wanted to just note --
- MS. MIGUELGORRY: There are two resolutions.
- 15 MEMBER CHESBRO: Oh, two resolutions. Okay. Both
- 16 resolutions, whatever the other one is.
- 17 MEMBER BROWN: 40 and 41.
- 18 MEMBER CHESBRO: 41.
- 19 But I wanted to note Fetzer, because at some point
- 20 in the late '90s, when I was on the Board, mid-'90s, went
- 21 out, and presented the award to Fetzer. And they are
- 22 still receiving the award. And I know, I have read
- 23 stories about them, you know, driving -- running their
- 24 trucks and other equipment on bio diesel. And I know,
- 25 they have installed solar paneling on all the winery

- 1 facilities, and they just continue to go beyond -- and I
- 2 haven't seen their specific application, and I don't know
- 3 how much they have done or changed since they were awarded
- 4 back in the '90s, but I have to assume they have continued
- 5 to progress and are an example of what I was talking
- 6 about.
- 7 MS. MIGUELGORRY: That's a great example. If I
- 8 can just add one more point and that is that the WRAP Web
- 9 site, as we know it, continues to include new businesses
- 10 that have not applied in years past and a continuation of
- 11 those businesses who have applied, as Mr. Chesbro says,
- 12 over a series of time, consecutively.
- 13 So we -- it's not unusual to find a business that
- 14 has actually applied and won 10 years ago in a row.
- 15 MEMBER CHESBRO: Am I correct in assuming, though,
- 16 that we wouldn't just give it to them for what they did
- 17 last year, that there would have to be a continuous
- 18 improvement --
- 19 MS. MIGUELGORRY: No. Our criteria becomes
- 20 tougher and tougher. Having been in this program for a
- 21 number of years, drafting the questions and including all
- 22 the programs, hopefully all of them, here at the Board, we
- 23 also engage with other staff that has input on these
- 24 questions. And we consistently hear how difficult the
- 25 application is.

- 1 But again, as you have already stated, the
- 2 educational aspect is really vital. And as an assistance
- 3 to the cities and counties, it really does a lot for them
- 4 in assisting -- to get to their goals as well as inviting
- 5 businesses to expand their programs, as you've stated.
- 6 Thank you.
- 7 MEMBER BROWN: Great. Thank you, Piper.
- 8 I second Resolution 2007-40 and 2007-41.
- 9 Can you call the roll?
- 10 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Brown?
- 11 MEMBER BROWN: Aye.
- 12 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Chesbro?
- MEMBER CHESBRO: Aye.
- 14 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?
- 15 ORGANICS & RESOURCE EFFIENCY BRANCH
- 16 SUPERVISOR TAYLOR: Chair Brown, can you indulge me for a
- 17 second. I'm Kevin Taylor, Organics Resource Efficiency
- 18 Branch.
- 19 And before we leave this item, I just want to say, first
- 20 of all, we have a new person, Cindy Rumenapp, who are one
- 21 of the many Caltrans refugees that we picked up.
- 22 Also, we will be coming back to the Board next
- 23 month with a WRAP item, just kind of overview of the item,
- 24 and looking at some options to upgrade the program or make
- 25 some changes.

- 1 And finally, this is kind of Piper's last hurrah
- 2 before she went to OLA. And she's done a lot of great
- 3 work here, almost eight years and she's given out --
- 4 helped give out many awards. And I think it would be
- 5 appropriate if we give Piper one award before she goes
- 6 down to OLA.
- 7 She saw many of these leave and go to other
- 8 businesses and organizations. We thought would be really
- 9 nice to give her one too, to take with her down to OLA. To
- 10 Piper Miguelgorry for her dedicated service to WRAP, 1999
- 11 to 2006 -- actually 2007. But thank you, Piper.
- 12 MEMBER BROWN: Thank you, Piper.
- MS. MIGUELGORRY: Thank you.
- (Applause.)
- 15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Very good, Piper.
- 16 MEMBER BROWN: That's on consent. Both of those
- 17 will go on consent.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, Chairman Brown.
- 19 Okay. We're on to item -- first, Jim? Here we
- 20 go.
- 21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you, Chairman
- 22 Petersen, and good morning Committee Members. Chairman
- 23 Petersen, I would like to ask your, and the Committee's
- 24 indulgence, if you will. I would like to defer my deputy
- 25 director report for a bit and ask your indulgence to

- 1 consider Item H out of order. That was going to be a
- 2 contractor presentation. We're trying to accommodate his
- 3 request to make an early afternoon flight. So if we could
- 4 entertain that item first, we would appreciate it.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: That's fine, Jim.
- 6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you, Chairman
- 7 Petersen.
- 8 This is just a brief introduction. This is a
- 9 report that was funded out of a contract, out of a
- 10 category five expenditure in the used oil allocation. You
- 11 know, you will hear about the similar class of item that
- 12 we will talk about at the Board meeting next week.
- 13 But it was kind of -- it was a source reduction
- 14 effort, you know, basically trying to look at oil change
- 15 frequency and seeing if there's any additional efforts
- 16 that the Board should be entertaining to encourage longer
- 17 intervals.
- 18 This item hasn't been officially published yet.
- 19 It's been in OPA undergoing, you know, final editorial
- 20 review. We expect it to appear, I'd say, probably within
- 21 the next 30 days. And then it will be made available to
- 22 the public at that time.
- We wanted to preview some of the recommendations
- 24 since they do figure prominently in the outreach study
- 25 that John Meyer has talked to you about yesterday.

- 1 With that, I will turn it over to staff and the
- 2 contractor.
- 3 MS. STOKES: Good morning. I'd like -- my name is
- 4 Dana Stokes. I'm with the Special Waste Branch. And I
- 5 would like to introduce Chuck Flacks, who lead the survey
- 6 portion of this study. And later, on Wes Schultz will
- 7 talk about the messages that were tested.
- 8 MR. FLACKS: Good morning, members of the Board,
- 9 Chairman. My name is Chuck Flacks. I'm with the Social
- 10 and Behavioral Research Institute at Cal State University
- 11 San Marcos. And we contracted to do this study for you.
- 12 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
- presented as follows.)
- MR. FLACKS: The title is "Busting the 3,000-Mile
- 15 Myth." And we will get to that as we go forward.
- 16 --00o--
- 17 MR. FLACKS: The project team is here, consisting
- 18 of both staff at the Social and Behavioral Research
- 19 Institute and Faculty Support from Dr. Schultz and from
- 20 Dana, here, at the CIWMB.
- 21 --000--
- MR. FLACKS: The goals of our portion were to look
- 23 at the factors that determine oil change behavior, to look
- 24 demographically and start to see some of the differences
- 25 in the types of people and their behavior.

- 1 Then we look to create messages to encourage
- 2 people to go longer between their oil changes. And we
- 3 actually tested the messages with focus groups.
- --000--
- 5 MR. FLACKS: The survey portion was a random
- 6 sample of 1002 California drivers, that we did between
- 7 December 1st and January 12th of last year.
- 8 The study -- we have slightly more women than men.
- 9 The average age was about 49. Unfortunately, I think it
- 10 was partly due to the subject matter and little bit to the
- 11 season that we were calling. We ended up with a slightly
- 12 wider and less Hispanic sample than we might have
- 13 expected. But we are confident that our results are
- 14 representative of California drivers.
- --o0o--
- MR. FLACKS: So the most important factors in oil
- 17 change behaviors, it turns out that people trust -- and
- 18 it's not that surprising -- but people trust their cars
- 19 with two professionals: At about roughly 60 percent of
- 20 folks either go to the type of, you know, quick lube
- 21 shops, or they take it to their dealers.
- --000--
- MR. FLACKS: How do they know that it's time to
- 24 change? It turns out that two-thirds of California
- 25 drivers have those little stickers on their windshields,

- 1 which is probably more than we expected.
- 2 --000--
- 3 MR. FLACKS: In addition they may have those
- 4 stickers, but they tend to report other means. You know,
- 5 only 26 percent said that it was the window sticker itself
- 6 that propelled them into the change place. About
- 7 40 percent said that it was the number of miles that they
- 8 traveled. More and more cars have vehicle systems in
- 9 place -- I know my car does, that tells me when it's time.
- 10 And I think we will see, with newer models, an increase
- 11 in the car actually telling you when it's time to change,
- 12 which I believe will support our hypothesis about
- 13 behavior.
- 14 --000--
- 15 MR. FLACKS: How often to do they change? It
- 16 turns out that accepted wisdom -- and here's where the
- 17 myth comes in -- is 3,000 miles. And it's -- we
- 18 informally talked to oil change facilities. This was not
- 19 part of our scope of work. But the sort of standard
- 20 recommendation is 3,000 miles. And it's when you go to
- 21 change places, that's often what you see written on your
- 22 sticker.
- The average -- and this is due, I think, to some
- 24 skewing in reporting -- was 4200.
- We compared it, though, to manufacturers'

1 recommendations. And there's -- there were significant

- 2 differences between what manufacturers recommend and that
- 3 3,000-mile standard.
- 4 And we also looked at different car -- we -- when
- 5 we looked at the manufacturers, we consulted with
- 6 approximately 200 different -- maybe 300 different models
- 7 and makes of cars, and fed that into the data for the
- 8 comparison purposes.
- 9 We came up with two groups: frequent changers and
- 10 waiters. Turns out the frequent changers are the majority
- of folks. Again, this speaks to the 3,000-mile behavior
- 12 standard.
- --000--
- MR. FLACKS: Who are the frequent changers?
- 15 They are more likely to be women. They are more
- 16 likely to drive imported cars. They tend to be normal
- 17 drivers as opposed to severe drivers. And I can talk
- 18 about that if you are interested. They are actually more
- 19 receptive to the idea of using synthetic oil and they are
- 20 more likely to have a reminder sticker on the windshield.
- 21 --000--
- MR. FLACKS: The biggest concern, and we proved
- 23 this with a lot of different statistical tests, was engine
- 24 wear. That's really what most people are worried about
- 25 when they go to change their oil. They are less concerned

- 1 about saving time.
- 2 Frequent changers were more likely to be concerned
- 3 about engine wear. And saving money and saving time were
- 4 more important to the people who tend to wait longer.
- 5 The strongest predictor of changing frequently was
- 6 engine wear.
- 7 --000--
- 8 MR. FLACKS: So given that, we decided, how are we
- 9 going to come up with messages that would appeal to people
- 10 and determine what might promote waiting longer between
- 11 changes?
- --000--
- MR. FLACKS: This is where Dr. Schultz came in.
- 14 And he put forward a -- how did that happen?
- 15 --000--
- MR. FLACKS: He put forward a way of looking at
- 17 the problem, either through a central root of information
- 18 processing of a peripheral root.
- 19 A central root is kind of appealing to people's
- 20 sense of logic and requires a little more effort to
- 21 understand. But with -- it's more likely to change
- 22 behavior, because you are really convincing them that what
- 23 they are doing is currently not the right way to go, and
- 24 we're going to show you that there's a better way.
- 25 Peripheral roots are going to be what you see on

- 1 TV: humorous messages or light things that are appeal to
- 2 people, that are fairly easy to forget. They might
- 3 produce big behavior in the short term. People might try
- 4 Pepsi versus Coke. But they don't last; it doesn't
- 5 produce lasting change.
- --000--
- 7 MR. FLACKS: Here's a diagram showing
- 8 Dr. Schultz's theoretical presentation. And given this,
- 9 in discussions with staff and with Dr. Schultz, we decided
- 10 to craft messages that appeal to the central root.
- Because this 3,000 mile myth is fairly ingrained
- 12 in people's behavior, it would take, I think, a reasonable
- 13 approach to convince people that they are, in fact,
- 14 benefitting the environment and not hurting their
- 15 vehicles.
- --o0o--
- MR. FLACKS: So we picked the psychographic
- 18 profile of the largest group. These were women, age 30 to
- 19 60, and who go to professional oil changers and dealers.
- 20 And we did an informal survey of folks, just presenting a
- 21 variety of the messages.
- 22 But three messages that we tested were: "Trust the
- 23 maker," which is the idea that your manufacturer is
- 24 generally telling you to go longer; then we talked about
- 25 the 3,000-mile myth as an option; and then we -- the third

- 1 one was "You can do better."
- 2 And the responses were pretty consistent. "Trust
- 3 the maker"; people felt that that was -- maybe had
- 4 religious overtones and they were concerned about it.
- 5 They didn't quite get it.
- The 3,000-mile myth piqued their curiosity pretty
- 7 much across the Board.
- 8 And "You can do better" felt like criticism.
- 9 We did the -- as I said, we did the informal
- 10 pretesting. We settled on the 3,000-mile myth.
- 11 --000--
- 12 MR. FLACKS: The focus groups, we promised to look
- 13 at a variety of different types of people. And we were
- 14 able to kind of kill two birds with two stones, or four
- 15 birds with two stones. The groups we looked at were --
- one was rural, one was urban, one was coastal, one was
- 17 inland, one was northern California, one was Southern
- 18 California. So we did one of our studies in San Diego and
- 19 one up here, in Sacramento. It was the group that we
- 20 talked about -- women, 30 to 60, who use professional
- 21 changers.
- --000--
- 23 MR. FLACKS: The key component of the message was
- 24 that the myth is out there, of 3,000 miles, and that
- 25 73 percent of California motorists believe that they

73

1 should change their oil more frequently than their

- 2 manufacturer is recommending. But in fact, improvements
- 3 in vehicle design and improvements in oil composition mean
- 4 that you can drive longer without hurting your car.
- 5 So the bottom line was, follow the manufacturers'
- 6 recommendations. And I conducted the focus groups, and I
- 7 can say that people were a little surprised that it was
- 8 sort of accepted wisdom, this 3,000 miles. And the
- 9 fact -- and people don't think, I ought to go look in any
- 10 manual to see if what they are telling me is true.
- 11 --000--
- 12 MR. FLACKS: So there was some positive reaction.
- 13 People found the information believable. It represented a
- 14 clear action. They were very impressed actually, with the
- 15 CIWMB credibility. And I'm not just saying that.
- They -- we showed them messages without the stamp,
- 17 you know, the State of California stamp. And then it was
- 18 like, "Well, who are you to tell me?" But if the state of
- 19 California is putting this message out, then it's
- 20 something that we feel better out.
- 21 Participants were motivated to find out more about
- 22 the issue and perhaps even change their behavior.
- 23 Something that they called for, that we didn't
- 24 think of, initially, was a Web site. You know, "Where can
- 25 I go to learn more about this?"

1 --000--

- 2 MR. FLACKS: Some of the negative reactions were,
- 3 I think, partly the result of just the -- what happens
- 4 when you tell people to study an ad for an hour and a
- 5 half: They start to pick it apart, so they did.
- 6 They found that the messages in the ads were too
- 7 focused. We chose to focus on the cars that were most
- 8 represented in the sample. And those tended to be
- 9 Japanese cars. And some of our folks were concerned.
- 10 "Well, I drive an old Ford, and you're not talking to me."
- 11 They thought that maybe only newer cars were the
- 12 only ones that could go longer between changes. They saw
- 13 environmental benefits, but they were concerned about
- 14 whether they are going to be violating their warranties,
- 15 and that was something that we didn't really account for
- 16 in the messaging. You know, it may be okay for your car,
- 17 but are you still going to honor my warranty if I drive
- 18 longer?
- 19 --00o--
- 20 MR. FLACKS: In addition to just looking at just
- 21 convincing people to go longer, we tested a concept of
- 22 synthetic oil. And I have to say, it was not a -- it
- 23 didn't go over very well. Some of that may have been who
- 24 we were speaking to. And the vast majority of folks we
- 25 spoke to did not -- and this was by design -- did not have

- 1 hands on relationships to their cars, their vehicles.
- 2 So synthetic oil? "Just put in my car what
- 3 works." And they didn't really know enough about the
- 4 product to understand cost and benefits. They tended to
- 5 be more comfortable with the messages we were telling them
- 6 before.
- 7 Some folks were actually curious, especially if it
- 8 meant they could go even longer and save even more money,
- 9 but they weren't eager to go rush out and try it.
- 10 --00o--
- 11 MR. FLACKS: So our conclusions were that the data
- 12 showed that most California drivers, you know, change
- 13 their oil more frequently, that their biggest fear is
- 14 engine wear, and it prompting people with a central root
- 15 as opposed to a peripheral root.
- 16 It does create some discomfort, and that's
- 17 actually not a bad thing. We want people to start
- 18 reevaluating their choices.
- 19 We believe the targeted messages to frequent
- 20 changers show potential, and that we can actually see some
- 21 behavioral change in the future.
- I will turn it over to questions.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Very interesting.
- 24 Questions?
- 25 MEMBER CHESBRO: Yeah. First of all, I love the

- 1 waste reduction premise of trying to find ways to generate
- 2 less waste oil through behavior change. I think it's
- 3 great.
- 4 I do have to say, though, in terms of the survey,
- 5 and I imagine if someone asked the people, "How often do
- 6 you brush your teeth?" or "How often do you go to the
- 7 dentist?" they would say -- the question is, how does what
- 8 they said differ from what they actually do?
- 9 And I don't know to what extent whether, as social
- 10 scientists, you have the capacity to know enough about the
- 11 way people respond in surveys to be able to sort of factor
- 12 that in and try to determine how approximately honest
- 13 people are being. Because I'm surprised by the numbers.
- 14 I mean, that percentage people who say they do it that
- 15 often surprises me. But and that's -- I guess that caused
- 16 me to start thinking about other examples of where people
- 17 might not be as completely honest with an interviewer
- 18 about their behaviors.
- 19 DR. SCHULTZ: I'll respond and then maybe Chuck
- 20 has some elaboration. I'm Wes Schultz, professor at
- 21 California State University.
- 22 The validity of responses in surveys is also an
- 23 issue. So when we do the surveys, we try and take that
- 24 into account. We ensure anonymity, we ensure
- 25 confidentiality so that we can produce valid responses.

- 1 If it becomes a big topic down the road, you can
- 2 do validation studies to try and match up self-report data
- 3 with their actual behavior.
- 4 But for something like this, given the topic,
- 5 given that there's no direct consequences to them, if they
- 6 tell you one way or the other, I'm confident that they
- 7 were -- to the best of their recollection -- there are
- 8 sort of cognitive biases that might go on in their
- 9 responses -- but I don't think we had social desirability
- 10 going on in responses here.
- 11 MEMBER CHESBRO: On a slightly different tack, I
- 12 think you mentioned different car models and warranties.
- 13 And you asked people what kind of car they drove too?
- DR. SCHULTZ: Yes.
- 15 MEMBER CHESBRO: I'm interested in whether you
- 16 noticed anything -- as a driver of two hybrids -- not at
- 17 the same time, obviously. I should have said the "owner
- 18 of two hybrids," I guess. I was quite stunned to notice
- 19 that in the owner's manual, it recommends 6,000 miles.
- 20 And of course my supposition about that is that because
- 21 the gasoline-powered engine isn't powering the car as
- 22 often. You have less wear and tear on the engine, which
- 23 also bodes well for the long-term life of the engine you
- 24 own.
- 25 But I'm curious if you noticed anything there, in

1 relation to whether the models you looked at were hybrids

- 2 and whether there was any greater awareness of the
- 3 relation to --
- 4 MR. FLACKS: Unfortunately, my memory of that data
- 5 on that level is not that good. But there was not a large
- 6 number of hybrids in the study, just off the top of my
- 7 head. We just didn't -- the market is not saturated.
- 8 MEMBER CHESBRO: It's a point of personal
- 9 curiosity. I saw it in the manual and thought that sounds
- 10 extraordinarily higher. It's higher than any other car
- 11 I've ever owned.
- 12 MR. FLACKS: Well, I did -- we did observe that
- 13 newer cars, manufacturers' recommendations tended to be
- 14 longer. So that's true.
- 15 MEMBER CHESBRO: Typically how much longer?
- 16 MR. FLACKS: It can be as much as 5,000, 6,000,
- 17 7,500.
- DR. SCHULTZ: Some of them in the 10,000 miles.
- 19 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: So the cooperation of the
- 20 auto manufacturers with the high performance oils and the
- 21 synthetics and engines burn cooler now, we can -- this is
- 22 very interesting to me, because we are still dealing with
- 23 a waste oil situation in the state and where all the oil
- 24 is going.
- 25 So it's the manufacturer that basically they rely

- 1 on.
- 2 That's the home run on their manuals -- right --
- 3 where people are looking?
- 4 DR. SCHULTZ: That's the source of data that we
- 5 use as the absolute. That's the standard that we used,
- 6 was the manufacturers' recommendations. There can be
- 7 other recommendations by the oil companies, by synthetics,
- 8 but we used what the manufacturer recommended.
- 9 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Well, the money is in the
- 10 manufacturer, because that's where the car and the
- 11 warranty is; right? So this is really interesting stuff.
- MR. FLACKS: It's complicated somewhat by the
- 13 fact, and I heard this from an anecdotal focus group data,
- 14 that sometimes, even at the manufacturer level -- so if
- 15 you go to your dealer for service, you may be getting a
- 16 different message than are in the manual. So that's --
- 17 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, yeah. It's money.
- DR. SCHULTZ: One of the things we heard is it's
- 19 an inexpensive fix; right? There's no harm in doing it.
- 20 And so if it's not very costly, then what are the
- 21 disadvantages economically to doing it more often? And so
- that's what we heard.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: So the message out there is
- 24 how do we get this across. And this is another important
- 25 thing is we deal with the environmental messaging --

- 1 right? -- and that's how we'll do it? That's the best
- 2 venue, how to do that?
- 3 DR. SCHULTZ: No.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: The manufacturers' manual
- 5 and environmental messaging?
- 6 MEMBER BROWN: I'm not convinced of that. I mean,
- 7 what popped out was people are concerned about engine
- 8 longevity and engine wear. And that's what really drives
- 9 their decision.
- 10 So if you are going to make an environmental
- 11 appeal you've got to link it with something that says, you
- 12 know, that you are not going to hurt your engine, that you
- 13 can go longer. I'm not sure that the environmental
- 14 message is really going to get across that central route
- 15 that you are targeting.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. One other question:
- 17 Now, we are doing a tire campaign with -- Jim, with, you
- 18 know, maintaining your tire levels or pressures and stuff
- 19 like that. Is there a way -- while your guys are here,
- 20 can we comingle those messages at one time: hey, your
- 21 tires and your oil. Can we get them to understand that?
- 22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: This is something we have
- 23 been working on. Mitch, you might want to speak on both
- 24 of our existing and proposed plans, for the beginning of
- 25 this cross-car -- oil and car maintenance message?

- 1 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Is John here?
- 2 DR. SCHULTZ: Can I add something on that point?
- 3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Yeah. You are the expert.
- 4 DR. SCHULTZ: Provided that it's a theme, I would
- 5 agree. But for the most part, when you are recommending
- 6 behavior change, the simpler you can be, the more direct
- 7 that you can be, the more effective ultimately you will
- 8 be; that if you combine too many messages, people get
- 9 confused, people don't -- they don't understand.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: They put the oil in the
- 11 tires then? I get it.
- 12 MEMBER CHESBRO: The other thing I didn't hear
- 13 you -- this is on the same topic. One difference between
- 14 the two is that changing your oil less often is more
- 15 convenient. Maintaining your tires is less convenient.
- 16 And convenience -- you know, in all of this, going back
- 17 to -- we've learned recycling and all kinds of other
- 18 things. You know, busy people, that's a really central
- 19 piece.
- 20 And I don't know if, in your research talked -- in
- 21 the focus groups, talked to people about that. Because
- 22 one of the reasons that I doubt that that high a
- 23 percentage of people do what they say they do is because
- 24 people are really busy. And convenience is -- you know,
- 25 people might want to change it at 3,000 but go, "Oh, god.

- 1 I've been so busy. I haven't had the time." And driving
- 2 your car down and dropping it off and taking the time to
- 3 do it is, in busy people's lives, a hassle.
- 4 So -- so the one thing I would say is that -- in
- 5 that regard is that they are sort of different in that
- 6 what we are asking people to do with the tires is checking
- 7 them off and then being more vigilant.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Throwing more ideas out
- 9 there.
- 10 DR. SCHULTZ: One more comment related to that.
- 11 Particularly with the women that we had talked
- 12 to --
- 13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Be careful.
- 14 MEMBER BROWN: I'm your target audience.
- DR. SCHULTZ: Cars are important.
- 16 MEMBER BROWN: Just so long as they don't break
- 17 down in the middle of the highway.
- DR. SCHULTZ: They fear that they will be broken
- 19 down and stranded on a highway. So the time and the money
- 20 did not emerge is an important factor in their decisions;
- 21 that it was safety, that it was engine wear, that it was
- 22 the longevity of the vehicle. And not the -- not the
- 23 inconvenience or the cost. That was seen as very minor.
- 24 And we were surprised by the severity --
- MEMBER CHESBRO: Maybe that was a male response.

- 1 MEMBER BROWN: I was going to say, I'm the target
- 2 audience, and I don't want it to break down, but I'm way
- 3 too busy to get my oil changed, except for when I
- 4 absolutely have to go because it's beyond what the
- 5 manufacturer said.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Wow.
- 7 MEMBER BROWN: And I don't inflate my tires.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: There you have it. Oh, we
- 9 talked about that.
- 10 TIRE MANAGEMENT BRANCH MANAGER DELMAGE: Mitch
- 11 Delmage, Waste Tire Management Branch.
- 12 We've always looked toward this outreach effort to
- 13 be a transportation focus in general. So recycle your
- 14 battery, you know, maintain your tires, change your oil at
- 15 the right frequency, recycle your oil, if you are going to
- 16 do it yourself. So we're looking at that bigger message
- 17 down the road.
- 18 But to speak to Wesley's comment, we found in our
- 19 focus groups as well, that the message that seemed to
- 20 stick the best was directed at people who take good care
- 21 of their cars. So the message was, it's not finished
- 22 until you check your tires, make sure they are running at
- 23 the right rate. So there is that component as well, so
- 24 even though it was a bit of a problem, people want to take
- 25 good care of their cars.

- 1 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Thanks, Mitch.
- 2 Any other questions or comments?
- 3 By the way, guys, that is really interesting
- 4 stuff. Thank you.
- 5 MEMBER BROWN: Fascinating.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Do we hear a motion or have
- 7 a motion?
- 8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: No motion on that one. Just
- 9 for information.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I want a motion here. I'm
- 11 just kidding.
- 12 MEMBER BROWN: I move that we move to the next
- 13 item.
- 14 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, there we go.
- THE REPORTER: Could we take a break?
- 16 MEMBER BROWN: Actually, I move that we take a
- 17 five-minute break.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: That's the motion.
- 19 (Thereupon a break was taken in
- 20 proceedings.)
- 21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Any ex partes?
- 22 MEMBER CHESBRO: Yes. I had a conversation with
- 23 the previous presenter, Mr. Schultz, about the public
- 24 education contract that was on yesterday's committee and
- 25 will be on the Board's agenda next Tuesday.

- 1 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I also had a conversation
- 2 with him.
- 3 Margo?
- 4 MEMBER BROWN: I'm up to date. I went and got
- 5 coffee. No conversations.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Jim? We're back to
- 7 what? Item D, Board Item 21.
- 8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: If you would just
- 9 accommodate me with just a brief deputy director's report.
- 10 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I'm sorry. Go ahead.
- 11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you, Chairman
- 12 Petersen.
- 13 And again, good morning, Board members. My name
- 14 is Jim Lee, deputy director for the Special Waste
- 15 Division.
- I had a couple of introductory remarks, basically
- 17 to bring the Board up to speed on the u-waste program,
- 18 particularly as we are on the eve of the anniversary of
- 19 the DTSC decision sunsetting the exemption for household
- 20 disposal of universal waste in the trash.
- 21 U-waste, as you're aware, is broadly defined as
- 22 batteries, fluorescent tubes, mercury thermostats, and
- 23 other electronic devices, which contain mercury or other
- 24 heavy metals, and are considered to be a threat to public
- 25 health and the environment.

86

1 We would like to -- I would like to utilize this

- 2 occasion to reflect on the Board's tangible
- 3 accomplishments in providing support to local
- 4 jurisdictions to assist with compliance with our u-waste
- 5 responsibilities.
- In August 2006, the Board made awards under the
- 7 15th cycle of the Household Hazardous Waste Grant Program.
- 8 As part of this cycle, the Board approved staff proposals
- 9 for a funding set aside of 500,000, for county or
- 10 region-wide grants to local jurisdictions, to facilitate
- 11 discussion and planning and outreach and public education
- 12 for addressing u-waste needs. Under this program, 34
- 13 jurisdictions receive grant awards from 7 to 15 thousand
- 14 dollars to jumpstart these efforts.
- 15 The Board also provided an additional \$4 million
- 16 in Household Hazardous Waste Program funding. Nineteen
- 17 grants were awarded, more than two-thirds of which were
- 18 used to address u-waste needs.
- 19 Specifically, eight grants focused on Take it Back
- 20 initiatives and more satellite drop-off collection
- 21 opportunities. Another nine are upgrading infrastructure
- 22 at existing facilities to accommodate u-waste collection.
- While on the subject of Take it Back, I want to
- 24 mention the Board's collaboration with the Department of
- 25 Toxic Substances Control and the California Take it Back

- 1 Partnership. This is a voluntary collaborative effort
- 2 among businesses and state and local agencies to provide
- 3 convenient locations for consumers to take back u-waste
- 4 materials. The Board has provided logistics support and
- 5 \$50,000 for public service announcements to be utilized at
- 6 the appropriate time, in support of the Take it Back and
- 7 other u-waste outreach efforts.
- 8 Staff continues to believe that this program has
- 9 great promise as a viable product stewardship alternative
- 10 to advance disposal fee approaches for detailing with HHW.
- 11 We believe it is very supportive of Board interest and
- 12 product stewardship, as expressed in Strategic Directive
- 13 5. However, we also realize that much still needs to be
- 14 done to deliver on the promise envisioned with the
- 15 California partnership, particularly in garnering the
- 16 support of major big box retailers which have a broad
- 17 regional presence.
- To this end, we all are committed and are
- 19 refocusing the efforts to secure participation by these
- 20 core retailer partners, as proof of concept and to ease
- 21 the burden currently being shouldered in large part by
- 22 what we know are underfunded local jurisdiction HHW
- 23 programs.
- 24 If these efforts do not garner the support that is
- 25 necessary to address the problem, staff remains open to

- 1 reconsidering our support for a voluntary approach in
- 2 favor of one based on legislative mandates.
- 3 That concludes my deputy director report, Chairman
- 4 Petersen. And with your permission, we're prepared to
- 5 move into today's agenda.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay.
- 7 Any questions?
- 8 MEMBER BROWN: Just a question. Just out of
- 9 curiosity, Jim, you mentioned that 34 of the planning
- 10 grants were awarded. How many applicants did we receive?
- 11 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 12 CORNWALL: All of the applicants that -- it was a
- 13 noncompetitive process, so you basically had to turn in a
- 14 piece of paper. So we funded everybody that applied,
- 15 those noncompetitive.
- MEMBER BROWN: Oh, good. What about the 19 of the
- infrastructure? Were we oversubscribed there?
- 18 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 19 CORNWALL: I would have to go book there and double check
- 20 that. I think that we were.
- 21 MEMBER BROWN: Okay.
- 22 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 23 CORNWALL: But there were a couple projects that received
- 24 partial funding. So I think we were pretty close to on
- 25 the mark on that one.

- 1 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Just curious since -- just
- 2 curious to know if there's more need out there than we
- 3 absolute -- were able to put on the street last year.
- 4 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 5 CORNWALL: Well, I think as Spencer moves forward with his
- 6 presentation and some of the changes that we've made to --
- 7 particularly at the coordination grants to simplify the
- 8 application process, so that we're going out and talking
- 9 with those counties that didn't apply, to really encourage
- 10 them to get on board. It was a new project -- program
- 11 last year, so....
- 12 MEMBER BROWN: Yeah. Okay. Great.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Jim?
- 14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you, Chairman
- 15 Petersen.
- 16 Committee Item E is Consideration of a Scoring
- 17 Criteria and Evaluation Process for the Household
- 18 Hazardous Waste Grant Program, 16th Cycle.
- 19 Indeed, as I alluded to in my opening remarks,
- 20 we're going to be utilizing pretty much the same strategy
- 21 with some modification that we -- that I just discussed
- 22 with you, that we utilized in the 15th.
- 23 So I will now ask Spencer Fine to make the staff
- 24 presentation.
- MR. FINE: Thank you, Jim.

- 1 And not to waste time, with respect to the focus
- 2 group, I have a hard time believing our Board chair is
- 3 part of that focus group. Maybe if they were under 30
- 4 years old, I would.
- 5 (Laughter.)
- 6 MEMBER BROWN: Thank you, Spencer.
- 7 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Nice try, Spencer.
- 8 (Thereupon an overhead presentation was
- 9 presented as follows.)
- 10 MR. FINE: Good day. I will be presenting the
- 11 agenda item for the consideration of the scoring criteria
- 12 and evaluation process for the Household Hazardous Waste
- 13 Grant Program, 16th cycle, Fiscal Year, 2007/2008.
- 14 Distinct from the Used Oil Program, the CIWMB does
- 15 not provide core funding to local jurisdictions for HHW
- 16 collection. Instead, they are given the authority to
- 17 charge fees to support collection activities.
- 18 Given that they often do not have resources
- 19 available to build facilities, thus the Board is providing
- 20 grant funds to assist local agencies. Statute gives
- 21 priority to rural areas, small cities, and regional
- 22 programs. This year, we were successful in our BCP, to
- 23 add an additional \$500,000 to the grant program.
- --000--
- MR. FINE: Similar to last year's HHW cycle, staff

- 1 is again proposing two types of grants for the cycle:
- 2 small regional coordination grants for each county, and
- 3 larger infrastructure u-waste program grants.
- 4 As Jim noted in his opening remarks, this approach
- 5 was well received by stakeholders last year.
- --000--
- 7 MR. FINE: For this year's coordination grant,
- 8 staff recommends the same funding level as last year, or
- 9 \$500,000 for grants ranging from \$7,000 to \$15,000,
- 10 depending on population.
- 11 Funds are set aside to allow for one grant per
- 12 county-wide area. Admittedly, this is not enough to pay
- 13 for all the planning and coordination needed, but it will
- 14 prime the pump.
- 15 So as not to find ourselves in the same place we
- 16 were last year, with the sunset of the u-waste exemption,
- 17 the focus of this year's coordination grants is on
- 18 home-generated sharps -- which will be banned from the
- 19 landfill beginning September 1st, 2008 -- sharps are
- 20 needles, syringes, and lancets.
- 21 And depending upon the local infrastructure, which
- 22 may already be in place to collect sharps, and due to the
- 23 continued challenges concerning u-waste, the grant also
- 24 offers counties the opportunity to continue their u-waste
- 25 planning or product stewardship.

92

1 This grant is not competitive. Each countywide

- 2 area that agrees to make a good faith effort at
- 3 coordination and document their findings will be funded.
- 4 Staff will use a streamlined application and report
- 5 process to assist jurisdictions who apply.
- --000--
- 7 MR. FINE: The bulk of this year's resources, or
- 8 \$4.5 million, is proposed for larger projects. Staff is
- 9 again proposing 200,000 for individual projects and
- 10 \$300,000 for regional ones. These funding levels have
- 11 worked well in the past, as state dollars typically
- 12 supplement local resources.
- 13 And this is a competitive process. And we want to
- 14 ensure projects funded throughout the state, the highest
- 15 ranking proposals will be ranked. But the top score in
- 16 each county will be funded first.
- 17 A county may receive a coordination grant and a
- 18 competitive grant.
- 19 --000--
- 20 MR. FINE: There are two categories of criteria
- 21 used in competitive scoring of the applications: general
- 22 and program.
- 23 General criteria reviews the overall quality of
- 24 the project. Applicants must address the need for the
- 25 project, goals and objectives, work plan, and the amount

- 1 of waste to be collected, and how they would evaluate the
- 2 effectiveness of the proposal to meet the identified need.
- 3 They will also be scored on the cost effectiveness
- 4 of their proposal, including use of in-kind services and
- 5 existing materials. The work plan and budget must also be
- 6 detailed, complete, and realistic.
- 7 --000--
- 8 MR. FINE: To ensure the most qualified projects
- 9 are eligible for funding, applications must receive a
- 10 minimum of 70 points in General Criteria, before they will
- 11 be eligible for Program Criteria points -- Priority
- 12 Points, pardon me.
- 13 These relate more to the type of project and
- 14 communities served. The Continuing Program Priority is
- 15 for infrastructure. Twelve counties have no permanent
- 16 facilities. Again, due to the number of years involved in
- 17 building the facility, grants for the initial planning and
- 18 design stages will also be eligible for funding.
- 19 Due to the continuing need to manage the
- 20 substantial u-waste stream, particularly fluorescent lamps
- 21 and batteries, the second priority area recommended for
- 22 funding is u-waste. Either facility expansions or
- 23 targeted programs, such as Take it Back, partnerships with
- 24 retail stores, other types of projects may also be
- 25 proposed for funding, but they are not eligible for the

- 1 six bonus points.
- 2 --000--
- 3 MR. FINE: Staff is requesting an exemption for
- 4 the board requirement for proportional north/south
- 5 geographic distribution of funds, due to the statutory
- 6 requirement to ensure competitive grant consideration for
- 7 small and rural jurisdictions.
- 8 --000--
- 9 MR. FINE: If the grant process is approved today,
- 10 the application process will begin this month. Funding
- 11 should be available to jurisdictions in September.
- --000--
- 13 MR. FINE: Staff recommends that the Committee
- 14 approve Option 1, to approve the proposed scoring
- 15 criteria, and adopt Resolution No. 2007-36.
- 16 This concludes my presentation.
- 17 If there are any questions, staff would be more
- 18 than happy to answer them. Thank you.
- 19 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Any questions?
- 20 MEMBER BROWN: I just have a quick question: Of
- 21 the 12 counties that have no permanent HHW facilities, do
- 22 you know, are they mostly small and rural jurisdictions?
- MR. FINE: I do not have the answer at this time.
- 24 I will defer the question to Supervisor Bonnie
- 25 Cornwall.

- 1 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 2 CORNWALL: I believe we listed them in the item. Fresno
- 3 is one of them. While it's a rural county, it's not seen
- 4 as one of our small counties.
- 5 MEMBER BROWN: Yeah. Can you tell me what page
- 6 that's on?
- 7 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 8 CORNWALL: I'm looking.
- 9 MEMBER BROWN: I am too. Okay. That's all right.
- 10 I will find it.
- 11 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 12 CORNWALL: We would be happy to send the list to the Board
- 13 members, of those counties that don't have a permanent
- 14 facility. And admittedly, it's not the best solution for
- 15 every county, depending on where the population is
- 16 located. But certainly, we've seen that in jurisdictions,
- 17 where they have moved from temporary events -- and there's
- 18 some really good data in L.A. County -- when they've moved
- 19 from temporary events or the roundups and gone to a
- 20 permanent facility, the volume of HHW collection increases
- 21 significantly.
- 22 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Oh, big time.
- 23 MR. FINE: I think I have found it.
- 24 MEMBER BROWN: Fresno County to Alpine have no
- 25 permanent facilities. It doesn't list them, so just an

- 1 e-mail would be great.
- 2 I'm just curious to find out -- and, you know, if
- 3 they are doing mobile roundup things.
- 4 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 5 CORNWALL: Yes. All the counties are doing something.
- 6 One of the things that we have undertaken as a contract
- 7 this year is we're -- we have been looking at what are
- 8 some of the barriers for these jurisdictions to move
- 9 forward.
- 10 And in a number of cases, you have a staff person
- 11 who's never managed a capital outlay or large project
- 12 before; so they are a little bit gun-shy in moving
- 13 forward. So we are developing a guidance manual and
- 14 training program to actually assist them and help make
- 15 that decision process simpler by identifying, sort of,
- 16 model facilities; how much does it generally cost to build
- 17 a variety of range of facilities; and have sort of a
- 18 decision making tree to move them along the way. So
- 19 that's the process.
- 20 MEMBER BROWN: Very good. Thank you.
- 21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. I have couple of
- 22 questions. It says on -- I guess we're on Page 22-8. And
- 23 it says here, in the third paragraph down, "Only the
- 24 highest scoring infrastructure grant per county area will
- 25 be awarded until passing proposals from each county area

- 1 submitting multiple applications have been funded."
- 2 Can you explain that to me?
- 3 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 4 CORNWALL: In some cases you may have, let's say, four
- 5 projects from one county that score pretty well. So let's
- 6 say you have four projects in San Diego, and we had some
- 7 other projects in northern rural California. So we would
- 8 like to sort of spread out the money in terms of serving
- 9 the counties.
- 10 So we go in rank order. But if there's a couple
- of projects from one county, we go down to the passing
- 12 proposal to make sure all counties get some coverage to
- 13 ensure statewide coverage. Because there's limited
- 14 funding available, we want it to be spread statewide.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I understand.
- 16 And another question is: When we're building
- 17 these permanent facilities, can we look at a sustainable
- 18 design criteria when they do this, and environmentally
- 19 preferred purchasing?
- 20 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 21 CORNWALL: Absolutely. That's one of the features in the
- 22 design manual that we're looking at, trying to identify
- 23 those facilities.
- 24 For example, the facility in Stockton, the siting
- 25 was done to do ensure good cross-ventilation. And we're

- 1 looking at as many green features as possible for the
- 2 facilities.
- 3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's very interesting,
- 4 because you can't use lead for this, because they have
- 5 never done anything like this. So we are just like
- 6 winging it; right?
- 7 GRANTS & CERTIFICATION SECTION I SUPERVISOR
- 8 CORNWALL: Well, I wouldn't say "winging it." I think the
- 9 design principals without -- they are still sound. You
- 10 have to look at siding, materials, thermal mass, etc.,
- 11 natural ventilation, natural lighting. But yeah.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. I think that's a
- 13 great thing.
- 14 Any other questions?
- Okay. Do we hear a motion?
- 16 Sorry, Evan. I should never forget you, Evan.
- 17 You're up.
- 18 MEMBER CHESBRO: You're the representative of
- 19 Edgar International.
- 20 MR. EDGAR: Evan Edgar representing CRRC.
- 21 Fully support the money going to our sharps.
- 22 Because once again, that would be a funding source to
- 23 support a plan before the ban. And the ban would be
- 24 effective September 1. I'm glad to see that linkage and
- 25 how the sharps out of the MRF waste stream is so critical.

- 1 So it's great to have this focus on sharps this year. And
- 2 commend the Waste Board staff for recognizing that.
- 3 Part of the deal last year, on the 15th cycle, was
- 4 the Take Back program to address U-Day from a year ago.
- 5 And a lot of money, over \$2 million, went towards Take
- 6 Back at the big boxes and retailers. And it crowded out
- 7 the funding for the infrastructure.
- 8 And at the time it was need, and had even Cheryl
- 9 Peace, in the minutes from August 15th, had a lot of
- 10 questions about the efficiency of Take Back, and having
- 11 over \$2 million of Waste Board resources go to big boxes
- 12 and retailers, whether it's more of a generator, producer
- 13 responsibility to fund that as opposed to state funding.
- 14 So that's more of a policy question. And the
- 15 reason I bring it up, because I had some infrastructure
- 16 cycle grants last year that were crowded out due to
- 17 funding and may not have qualified for many reasons. But
- 18 most of money went to Take Back.
- 19 As we move forward to the next cycle, as a
- 20 follow-up on the Take Back programs, are they really
- 21 working at the big boxes, the retailers; are they
- 22 efficient? Are they effective? So more of a policy
- 23 question as you get applications in the part of the 16th
- 24 cycle is: Do you want to fund Take Back to the same
- 25 level? Or are there other methods to fund Take Back and

- 1 use the \$5 million to fund rural infrastructure at rural
- 2 facilities that are expanding in infrastructure, to
- 3 service not only u-waste, but all types of the HHW.
- 4 So that's my -- more of a policy question to
- 5 promote more of the infrastructure funding as apposed to
- 6 Take Back funding.
- 7 Thank you.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, Evan.
- 9 Jim?
- 10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Yes, thank you, Chairman
- 11 Petersen.
- 12 I very much appreciate Mr. Edgar's remarks in this
- 13 area. As you know, I'm a strong personal proponent of,
- 14 you know, the private sector doing more. But that's one
- 15 of the reasons why, again, we are so behind the Take It
- 16 Back initiatives. Because ultimately, you know, the
- 17 retail take back, you know, it's basically a precursor to
- 18 a -- it's a product stewardship of manufacturer
- 19 responsibility initiative in the long run.
- 20 You know, ultimately, we feel the cost for these
- 21 many HHW streams need to be built in, into the price of
- 22 the product, initially.
- 23 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Producer responsibility.
- DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Exactly.
- 25 So we think it's something that the Board needs to

- 1 continue to support. And again, the money that we
- 2 provided through Take It Back isn't going to the retailers
- 3 per se. It's going to the local jurisdictions for them to
- 4 work with the retailers to kind of introduce them to
- 5 the -- to the idea to get them comfortable with it, to --
- 6 so that they can also show that in many cases, as we've
- 7 seen in our oil program, you know, that when people, you
- 8 know, entertain the take back of waste oil, there's
- 9 actually additional business that can be generated.
- 10 So you know, we're trying to expose, through the
- 11 local jurisdictions, get the retail core business
- 12 involved. And ultimately, like I said, you know, lead to
- 13 some of these product stewardship initiatives, which we
- 14 think have merit. So....
- 15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's tough. And we had
- 16 e-waste and u-waste and oil and all this other stuff and
- 17 it just gets overwhelming and you got to figure out how to
- 18 make this all happen. We don't have enough money to do
- 19 that, do we?
- 20 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: We do not.
- 21 But again, I think as Spencer alluded to in his
- 22 remarks, you know, the statute does provide basic for the
- 23 locals, you know, to use, you know, their taxing or fee
- 24 authority, you know, to handle these waste streams.
- 25 However, despite that, and that fact not

- 1 withstanding, you know, the Waste Board is working well
- 2 within its statutory provisions and its fund availability
- 3 to assist in every way possible.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's a tough one.
- 5 John?
- 6 MR. CUPPS: Thank you, Mr. Chair Petersen, Mr.
- 7 Chairman.
- 8 For the record, my name is John Cupps. I'm a
- 9 consultant. One of my clients is the San Luis Obispo
- 10 Integrated Waste Management Authority. We were a
- 11 successful applicant on these grants and we -- the
- 12 household hazardous waste grants on the last cycle. And
- 13 it was to, in fact, fund the rollout of a Take Back
- 14 Program, and we're just in the process of rolling that
- 15 program out now.
- But I can -- I can tell you, the fact that we can
- 17 offer to the retailers the ability to pay for the
- 18 collection has been a very significant factor in their
- 19 willingness to participate.
- 20 Now, in terms of product, you know, manufacturer
- 21 and retailer responsibility, we have also drafted -- we
- 22 have a draft mandatory Take Back ordinance that we're
- 23 working on. But just in the short term, I think funding,
- 24 you know, this type of funding to get these programs up
- 25 and running is absolutely critical. So I would urge you

- 1 to continue in that vein.
- 2 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay.
- 3 MR. CUPPS: But the long-term goal is clearly to
- 4 go towards manufacturer and retailer responsibility on it.
- 5 Hopefully, we will be able to convince them to do it on a
- 6 voluntary basis. But like I said, we've already drafted a
- 7 mandatory ordinance and headed that direction.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Go for it.
- 9 Thank you.
- 10 MR. CUPPS: Thank you.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Any other comments?
- 12 Questions?
- 13 MEMBER BROWN: I move Resolution 2007-36.
- 14 MEMBER CHESBRO: Second.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb?
- 16 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Brown?
- 17 MEMBER BROWN: Aye?
- 18 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Chesbro?
- 19 MEMBER CHESBRO: Aye.
- 20 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?
- 21 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.
- Move that to consent.
- Okay, Jim.
- 24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you, Chairman
- 25 Petersen.

- 1 Committee Item F is Consideration of the Grant
- 2 Awards for the Targeted Rubberized Asphalt Concrete
- 3 Incentive Grant Program.
- 4 Nate Gauff is going to make the presentation on
- 5 behalf of staff and bring your attention the award that we
- 6 are proposing -- the applicant that we are proposing for
- 7 award this afternoon.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good morning, Nate.
- 9 MR. GAUFF: Well, I will say good afternoon since
- 10 it is afternoon.
- 11 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Good afternoon, Nate.
- 12 MR. GAUFF: Good afternoon, Chairman Petersen and
- 13 Committee members. I'm Nate Guaff of the Special Waste
- 14 Division.
- 15 For this iteration of the Targeted Rubberized
- 16 Asphalt Concrete Incentive Grant Program, we have one
- 17 eligible applicant, which is the City of Stockton. And
- 18 the funding recommendation is \$175,000.
- 19 I recommend that the Board approve the proposed
- award and adopt Resolution 2007-37.
- 21 Any questions?
- 22 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I have a question: Is that
- 23 revised?
- MR. GAUFF: Yes, that's revised.
- 25 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Any questions? Comments?

- 1 MEMBER CHESBRO: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
- 2 The -- I don't have a intermediate term
- 3 perspective on the status of this -- the funds available
- 4 for these grants. But it looks like it's diminishing over
- 5 time -- is that correct? -- in terms of how much money is
- 6 being granted by the Board?
- 7 MR. GAUFF: You are talking about as far as the
- 8 award for this fiscal year?
- 9 MEMBER CHESBRO: Well, the -- for example, the two
- 10 Five-Year Plans: The 05/06 Five-Year Plan had 3,570,000
- 11 the 06/07 \$2,100,000. And so I'm just curious what the --
- 12 to understand what's going on with the funding.
- 13 Maybe that's just a slight fluctuation and it will
- 14 go back up again. I don't know. Or is that a Board
- 15 policy that's moved that money elsewhere? I'm just trying
- 16 to --
- 17 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: I believe, Mr. Chesbro, I
- 18 think the Five-Year Plan for the allocations which were
- 19 set two years ago, they don't reflect the additional money
- 20 that was made available to the Board through approved BCP,
- 21 additional \$5 million for 05/06 and 06/07. And so the
- 22 targeted RAC program, of which this is a part of that
- 23 award item, was supplemented with, I believe, an
- 24 additional \$4 millions.
- 25 The amount that's available for these types of

- 1 awards between now and June 30th is about 3.2 million.
- 2 And so I think we want to propose to award 175,000 today.
- 3 And just as a kind of a preview for next month, we've got
- 4 four or five applications in the pipeline right now, that
- 5 look to be in the 6 to 7 hundred thousand dollar total.
- 6 MEMBER CHESBRO: So the rate at which the money is
- 7 going out for these projects is pretty consistent and
- 8 stable or has been?
- 9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: The rate of funding is
- 10 various and it's kind of seasonal. You know, right now
- 11 this is not the time --
- 12 MEMBER CHESBRO: I mean, year to year, not
- 13 necessarily month to month.
- 14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: It's going up.
- 15 MEMBER CHESBRO: It's going up. Okay. Thank you.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Do I hear a motion?
- 17 MEMBER BROWN: Move Resolution 2007-37, Revised.
- 18 MEMBER CHESBRO: I will second.
- 19 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Second there. Deb?
- 20 MEMBER CHESBRO: In the Senate, we don't get
- 21 second. So I'm mentally lazy about that.
- 22 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's okay.
- 23 MEMBER CHESBRO: I'm having to remember.
- 24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's okay. We'll be fine.
- 25 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Brown?

1 MEMBER BROWN: Aye?

- 2 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Chesbro?
- 3 MEMBER CHESBRO: Aye.
- 4 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?
- 5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.
- 6 Okey-dokey. That was fiscal consent. I got that.
- 7 Okay.
- 8 And we're ready for Item G, Item 24?
- 9 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Thank you, Chairman
- 10 Petersen.
- 11 Item G is Consideration of Scope and Work and
- 12 Contractor for the State Agency Partnership to Support the
- 13 Use of Tire-Derived Products Contract.
- 14 Some Board members will recollect that we had a
- 15 similar program to showcase various tire-derived products
- 16 that -- at Cal Expo last year.
- 17 This is a proposal to have the same sort of venue
- 18 at a different location in the state. So I will ask Linda
- 19 Dickinson to discuss that and make the rest the staff
- 20 presentation.
- 21 MS. DICKINSON: Good afternoon, Chair Gary
- 22 Petersen. I'm Linda Dickinson with the Product Promotion
- 23 and Assistance Section for the Special Waste Division.
- 24 Staff is requesting consideration of an
- 25 interagency agreement with the California Big Fresno Fair,

- 1 for 400,000, from fiscal year 06/07 funding.
- 2 Big Fresno Fair is to host more than 1.5 million
- 3 people who attend events at the fairgrounds throughout the
- 4 year.
- 5 During the annual Big Fresno Fair, typically more
- 6 than 570,000 people attend the 12-day run. Big Fresno
- 7 Fair is ready to include the tire-derived product
- 8 installations for viewing during the 2007 State Fair in
- 9 October.
- 10 California is faced with the challenge of
- 11 diverting or safely managing more than 40 million used and
- 12 waste tires that it generates annually. And staff
- 13 estimates that 30 million tires, 75 percent, are diverted
- 14 annually for various alternative uses, including reuse,
- 15 retreading, recycling, and combustion.
- To prevent the remaining 10 million from damaging
- 17 the environment, it is more desirable to support markets
- 18 that lead to recycling this material. The objective of
- 19 this project is to increase the markets for tire-derived
- 20 products by exposing and informing the public of future
- 21 agency -- informing the public and future government
- 22 agency purchasers of economical viable end uses and of the
- 23 recycled rubber products.
- 24 The goal of this project is to first replace
- 25 existing products purchased, and second, to create and

- 1 increase a sustainable market within the end user -- end
- 2 use consumer.
- 3 As part of this effort, Big Fresno Fair will be
- 4 required to provide follow-up reports that detail how
- 5 successful any replacement products perform and whether
- 6 the product would be purchased in the future.
- 7 Additionally, any rubber product purchased or
- 8 manufactured would have to be made with 100 percent
- 9 California generated waste tire-derived rubber.
- 10 Further, at most of the project locations, the
- 11 contractor will place signage indicating that the Board is
- 12 the sponsor of the project with the mention of the number
- 13 of waste tires diverted.
- 14 Stacy Rianda will gladly go into detail about the
- 15 LED signage, press releases, and permanent signage that
- 16 the Big Fresno Fair will install and prepare. Recycled
- 17 tire products will be installed or used for various
- 18 programmatic areas throughout the fairgrounds and in the
- 19 fairgrounds buildings. Possible uses include but are not
- 20 limited to rubber sports floor, installed in the
- 21 industrial commerce building; rubber mats used for
- 22 employees and the public throughout the grounds; rubber
- 23 granules for use by kids in the kids park area; rubber
- 24 mulch material used by the landscape department in
- 25 floriculture; rubber sandbags used to enhance cleaner

- 1 storm water drain off; rubber traffic delineators used in
- 2 parking areas; rubber mats in restrooms areas throughout
- 3 the grounds; rubber mats for horse and animal stalls.
- 4 Options for the Board include approving the scope
- 5 of work and California Big Fresno Fair as contractor, and
- 6 adopting Resolution No. 2007-38; or approve it with
- 7 specific changes.
- 8 We recommend that the Board approve Resolution
- 9 2007-38.
- 10 Additionally, for next year -- this is in the next
- 11 Five-Year Plan -- and we have contacted Orange County
- 12 Fair, and we can set up an additional interagency
- 13 agreement with them, and they are happy that we contacted
- 14 them, and are excited about the same kind of projects.
- 15 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great. Thank you.
- 16 MEMBER BROWN: Hey Linda, have we gotten feedback
- 17 yet on that form, that you mentioned on feedback and
- 18 utilization, from Cal Expo yet?
- 19 MS. DICKINSON: Yes.
- 20 MEMBER BROWN: Are they purchasing more?
- MS. DICKINSON: Yes. They have only spent 96,000
- of the \$400,000 contract. I got a project update from
- 23 them, actually, yesterday. And they are ready for next
- 24 year. Actually, I'm going to be meeting with them in two
- 25 weeks. They will be doing LED and daily reports, as will

- 1 the Big Fresno Fair. And I just talked with Rex Hime on
- 2 that also.
- 3 MEMBER BROWN: Do they have three years to spend
- 4 that money?
- 5 MS. DICKINSON: They have one more additional
- 6 year, because the money was already a year old when we
- 7 awarded it to them.
- 8 MEMBER BROWN: Okay. Thank you.
- 9 MS. DICKINSON: One and a half because it's -- you
- 10 know.
- 11 MEMBER CHESBRO: Mr. Chair, as I appreciate the
- 12 Board and the staff bear with me, because in each case
- 13 it's usually context, because these things -- not having
- 14 been involved for a while, I don't know everything that's
- 15 going on with them. You probably already know the answers
- 16 to all these things.
- 17 But can you give me context with what's going on
- 18 with state agency partnerships in general? Are we just
- 19 doing fairs, or are there other state agencies that we are
- 20 recruiting to use these materials, or that they are
- 21 approaching us and that we're -- or is this a very
- 22 specific fair-oriented effort?
- MS. DICKINSON: Well, in the beginning of this
- 24 project, at the Five-Year Plan, we did contact the
- 25 Department of Parks and Recs.

- 1 MEMBER CHESBRO: That's the first one that came to
- 2 my mind, as a potential user, especially since they got a
- 3 resources bond to improve their facilities.
- 4 MS. DICKINSON: Right. The projects that they
- 5 submitted to us did not use a lot of tires; were not well
- 6 thought out; did not expose the public to venues; would
- 7 not have exposed the public to any venues, actually; would
- 8 not have been exposed to signage to the CIWMB; and their
- 9 response was lacking.
- 10 MEMBER CHESBRO: And how recently was this?
- 11 MS. DICKINSON: That was last year, right before
- 12 the contract.
- 13 MEMBER CHESBRO: Okay.
- 14 MS. DICKINSON: And then we found Cal Expo who
- 15 was -- who better responded.
- 16 MEMBER CHESBRO: But -- but we haven't had other
- 17 examples in other areas of state government? This has
- 18 pretty much been a state -- I mean a --
- 19 MS. DICKINSON: Well, we've also worked with
- 20 Caltrans.
- 21 MEMBER CHESBRO: Obviously Caltrans is the big
- 22 one. State parks come to mind, state hospitals, the
- 23 prisons.
- MS. DICKINSON: We have a contract with prisons.
- Go ahead, Mitch.

- 1 TIRE MANAGEMENT BRANCH MANAGER DELMAGE: Over the
- 2 years, you know, we've contacted many state agencies and
- 3 we've contracted with several of them. We've had mixed
- 4 results.
- 5 Last year, we did the fair. Seemed to be well
- 6 received.
- 7 MEMBER CHESBRO: My question is not critical of
- 8 doing fairs. Don't misinterpret it.
- 9 TIRE MANAGEMENT BRANCH MANAGER DELMAGE: Oh, I
- 10 know. I know.
- 11 MEMBER CHESBRO: I'm trying to understand that --
- 12 MS. DICKINSON: I think we add a contract with
- 13 CYA, one of the CYA events in the weight room.
- 14 TIRE MANAGEMENT BRANCH MANAGER DELMAGE: We've had
- 15 several over the years. And it's out there for anybody.
- 16 MEMBER CHESBRO: There's funding, potential
- 17 funding, available?
- 18 MEMBER BROWN: There will be funding for the
- 19 next -- you know, for the foreseeable future, we're
- 20 recommending, to keep this program going, in the next
- 21 iteration of the Five-Year Plan.
- 22 So any ideas that we get from the public or from
- 23 Board members or other staff, we'll pursue it. The fair
- 24 just happened to be a good hit for us. We're looking at
- 25 possibly doing the Orange County Fair next year.

- 1 But again, we're not limited to fairs at all.
- 2 MEMBER CHESBRO: Well, the ones that we have
- 3 talked about, if you're considering utilization,
- 4 demonstration of utilization, and education, then
- 5 obviously a more public setting than Corrections, for
- 6 example. You might be, you know, educating a few people,
- 7 but only a certain class of people, a few classes of
- 8 people. But parks seem like a -- you know, if you are
- 9 paving a trail or a park access road, that's seems like a
- 10 real logical place to be -- just like a fair is a place
- 11 where people are going to be exposed and educated and get
- 12 information.
- 13 A park is usually -- a visit to a park has similar
- 14 characteristics. And it seems interesting to me.
- 15 There were problems -- and it might be something
- 16 that could be dealt with through providing better
- 17 technical assistance to them, to understand what is
- 18 necessary to get funded. They do have, because of both
- 19 a -- a -- something that was placed in the budget for
- 20 deferred maintenance of parks and also a bond measure that
- 21 the voters approved this last year.
- 22 So like Caltrans, they have a much smaller scale,
- 23 but they have a chunk of money to spend on improving the
- 24 parks in the immediate future. And so trying to direct
- 25 them towards -- they are going to be paving or other kinds

- 1 of playgrounds or other things they might be doing to
- 2 improve public facilities, it seems like there's a real
- 3 opportunity there, that we ought to be pursuing.
- 4 MS. DICKINSON: Great. Maybe we can open up the
- 5 tire-derived product grant to that state agency too.
- 6 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's a great idea.
- 7 MEMBER BROWN: Maybe use a whole project as a
- 8 demonstration. Maybe partner with the Parks Department
- 9 and offer to help to them redesign or help upgrade a park
- 10 with rubber sidewalks, the tire-derived product grants, a
- 11 kids' play park, you know, that's handicap accessible.
- 12 Show them the benefits of what all these products can do,
- 13 and then maybe do an entire one that you can use as a
- 14 demonstration for publicity, for other jurisdictions that
- 15 are looking to upgrade their parks.
- DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: We'll look into that, Madam
- 17 Chair.
- 18 MEMBER CHESBRO: Again, I was looking for context.
- 19 I'm not questioning that approach here. Although it is a
- 20 lot of money, but I presume -- since it's a big fair, I'm
- 21 sure they --
- 22 MEMBER BROWN: The Big Fresno Fair.
- 23 MEMBER CHESBRO: I'm sure they will put it to good
- 24 use.
- MS. DICKINSON: We were talking about Fresno

116

1 earlier. And we brought the contractor if you have any

- 2 questions for her.
- 3 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Okay. Great.
- 4 MS. DICKINSON: Stacy Rianda.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great.
- 6 MEMBER BROWN: Stacy, I would like to hear about
- 7 your signage, because I did talk to Linda and Jim about
- 8 that. And I think that's an important component of this
- 9 grant is public outreach and letting the public know
- 10 what -- what actually is being diverted and that -- how
- 11 many tires are being diverted.
- 12 So tell me a little bit about the signage and how
- 13 we do that.
- MS. RIANDA: Absolutely. That's the whole reason
- 15 why we're doing this, is to help educate the public and
- 16 let them know what products are available.
- 17 The signage can be anything that we collectively
- 18 decide we want it to be. It can be as big as we need it
- 19 to be. We have partnerships with sign companies so that
- 20 we can have them professionally made. We have sign
- 21 carvers, so if in our park area if we want to do a wooden
- 22 sign that's hand carved, we can do that. We can do a
- 23 multitude of things, as long as everybody is in agreeance.
- 24 MEMBER BROWN: Great. Visual. So it's easy. You
- 25 know, you get probably 30 seconds, somebody walking by.

- 1 If they can see it and it's visual, and they understand it
- 2 in a snapshot.
- 3 MS. RIANDA: Exactly.
- 4 MEMBER CHESBRO: Another component would be
- 5 durability and long-term nature of the education. Because
- 6 I've -- I noticed, and I won't mention it on the
- 7 microphone, a project I know that we funded back in the
- 8 '90s that the sign disappeared after a while. And you
- 9 know, having it be -- being something that could -- could
- 10 be expected to be there for an extended period of time.
- 11 MS. RIANDA: Yes. Not a problem.
- 12 MEMBER BROWN: Thank you for coming up.
- 13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: And I have another
- 14 question.
- MS. RIANDA: Yes.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I'm good on this. I'm good
- 17 on signs. I'm good on signs.
- 18 What institutional outreach are we doing with
- 19 regards to -- I can think of hockey rinks, things like
- 20 that, venues where they use rubberized for the interior
- 21 corridors of those places.
- 22 Are we doing institutional outreach here?
- 23 TIRE MANAGEMENT BRANCH MANAGER DELMAGE: Each
- 24 year -- we haven't done a broadcast announcement, but each
- 25 year we hear, like in these venues, of places to check

- 1 out. And so we give them a call, check them out, let them
- 2 know what we have available, and either get a response or
- 3 not, and follow up on the ones that seem interested and
- 4 have a good idea.
- 5 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: I'm just trying to help do
- 6 some outreach here. And it's like with the LEEDS program
- 7 to the architects and -- there's a lot that you can do
- 8 here. And I mean, it's the beginning of probably what --
- 9 doing some of this stuff. But I'm just thinking, there's
- 10 a lot of possibilities in the institutional side.
- 11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Are you talking about in the
- 12 private or the public sector?
- 13 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: The private.
- 14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: The private sector.
- 15 TIRE MANAGEMENT BRANCH MANAGER DELMAGE: These are
- 16 for state agencies.
- 17 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Right. So we can't help
- 18 the private sector at all.
- 19 TIRE MANAGEMENT BRANCH MANAGER DELMAGE: No.
- 20 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: No. Oh.
- 21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEE: Well, we can help them
- 22 indirectly. You know, there are only a -- there's only
- 23 certain designated opportunities where the Board can
- 24 provide money directly to private sector. You know, you
- 25 get into -- get into public fund considerations. But

- 1 clearly, I think on all three marks that we've discussed
- 2 today, we've talked about trying to encourage the private
- 3 sector, trying to support them where we can.
- 4 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Well, the demonstrations
- 5 with the Fresno Fair and everything else, we're getting it
- 6 out to these guys to let them know, here, go take a look
- 7 at this stuff.
- 8 MEMBER CHESBRO: Mr. Chairman, there was a thought
- 9 I didn't quite complete on my previous point. And that
- 10 was: The reason why agencies -- maybe it's self-evident.
- 11 But the reasons why agencies that have money from bonds
- 12 are good is you get maximum bang for your buck.
- 13 In other words, you can -- they are doing a
- 14 project anyway, and you just contribute the component.
- 15 Then there's much -- a lot more gets done for the dollars
- 16 to get put in, if they have money for -- if they already
- 17 have money to work with. And that's true of both Parks
- 18 and Caltrans, I'm assuming.
- 19 TIRE MANAGEMENT BRANCH MANAGER DELMAGE: And we
- 20 just actually finished up the Park bonds that were given
- 21 many years ago. The last ones are finishing up this year.
- 22 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Great.
- We have one speaker, Terry Leveille.
- Good afternoon.
- 25 MR. LEVEILLE: Good afternoon. Thank you. Terry

- 1 Leveille. Mr. Chairman, Committee Members, Terry Leveille
- 2 on behalf of TL & Associates and the Tire Dealers
- 3 Association of California, the Lakin Tire BAS, etc. etc.
- 4 These are really good programs. I really, you
- 5 know -- my hat is off to all the -- my hat's off to all
- 6 the programs dealing with the state fairs, because they do
- 7 get the message out.
- 8 We want to remember the big picture though.
- 9 Ultimately, this program is meant to market these types of
- 10 products so that ultimately these people will buy them on
- 11 their own. And including -- including state fairs,
- 12 including county fairs, etc., etc.
- 13 Earlier today, we talked about some of the RAC
- 14 programs. My understanding of that targeted RAC program
- 15 was that we're winnowing down the targeted RAC program,
- 16 because it is for first-time users or seldom occasional
- 17 users. And cities and counties and Caltrans as well are
- 18 finding out that RAC is such a great product, that they
- 19 don't need the little assistance, the financial assistance
- 20 to buy this product.
- 21 And we're hoping, over the next few years, that
- 22 these kind of -- these kind of projects will, you know, go
- 23 the way of the horse and buggy because these cities and
- 24 counties and certainly Caltrans know that this product, in
- 25 life cycle cost, is cheaper and certainly is better.

- 1 And we want -- we would like to just reiterate
- 2 once and again, that ultimately this program is to cities,
- 3 counties, private sector, to tire-derived products will
- 4 be, you know, winnowing away, down the line, as people
- 5 discover that these products are good products. And if
- 6 they don't, I mean, you know, that's the -- the proof's in
- 7 the marketplace there.
- 8 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Right. Well, remember, SB
- 9 650, when we did the recycling grants, and you will
- 10 remember this, is that -- it was -- there was a sunset on
- 11 that -- on that legislation. But we learned about
- 12 recycling. We proved that you can make a dollar doing the
- 13 right things in recycling. And you know, this is the same
- 14 kind of MO. I know we don't have a sunset on this thing.
- 15 But of the cities I'm talking to, and the people I'm
- 16 talking to, they like the product, big time.
- 17 MR. LEVEILLE: They like the product, yeah.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: It's just a matter of time.
- MR. LEVEILLE: And once again --
- 20 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: But Terry, you are going to
- 21 appropriate the heck out of this; right?
- MR. LEVEILLE: Absolutely. I love it.
- When the state fairs started getting into the
- 24 various products -- because, you know, I know a lot of
- 25 people that make these products and they make good stuff.

- 1 Ultimately, the Board, the Tire Fund, as you well
- 2 know, has way too much money.
- 3 When you were asking earlier if there's
- 4 additional -- you know, for the targeted RAC, the Board
- 5 has lots of money for the Tire Fund. And probably too
- 6 much, to the point where staff oftentimes scurries to find
- 7 programs to spend it.
- 8 And so that's what ultimately we would like to
- 9 see -- you know, an examination of -- of winnowing down
- 10 into this type of program.
- I just wanted to raise that issue here.
- 12 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Thank you, Terry.
- 13 Any response?
- 0kay.
- 15 All right. Do I hear any other comments?
- MEMBER BROWN: Move Resolution 2007-38.
- 17 MEMBER CHESBRO: Oh. Second.
- 18 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Deb?
- 19 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Brown?
- 20 MEMBER BROWN: Aye.
- 21 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Chesbro?
- MEMBER CHESBRO: Aye.
- 23 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT BALLUCH: Petersen?
- 24 CHAIRPERSON PETERSEN: Aye.
- That concludes this committee meeting.

Thank you, everybody. Thank you very much. (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste Management Board, Permitting and Enforcement Committee meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m.)

124 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 1 2 I, KATHRYN S. KENYON, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify: 3 4 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the 5 foregoing California Integrated Waste Management Board, 6 Sustainability and Market Development Committee meeting 7 was reported in shorthand by me, Kathryn S. Kenyon, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, 8 and thereafter transcribed into typewriting. 9 10 I further certify that I am not of counsel or 11 attorney for any of the parties to said workshop nor in any way interested in the outcome of said workshop. 12 13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 14 20th day of February, 2007. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 KATHRYN S. KENYON, CSR 24 Certified Shorthand Reporter

License No. 13061